arXiv:1406.7065v1 [math.RA] 27 Jun 2014

Weak crossed-product orders over valuation rings

John S. Kauta

School of Computing, Information & Mathematical Sciences
The University of the South Pacific
Suva
FIJI ISLANDS.

Abstract

Let F be a field, let V be a valuation ring of F of arbitrary Krull dimension (rank), let K be a finite Galois extension of F with group G, and let S be the integral closure of V in K. Let $f : G \times G \mapsto K \setminus \{0\}$ be a normalized two-cocycle such that $f(G \times G) \subseteq S \setminus \{0\}$, but we do not require that f should take values in the group of multiplicative units of S. One can construct a crossed-product V-order $A_f = \sum_{\sigma \in G} Sx_\sigma$ with multiplication given by $x_\sigma s x_\tau = \sigma(s) f(\sigma, \tau) x_{\sigma\tau}$ for $s \in S$, $\sigma, \tau \in G$. We characterize semihereditary and Dubrovin crossed-product orders, under mild valuation-theoretic assumptions placed on the nature of the extension K/F.

Keywords: Crossed-product orders, Weak crossed-product orders, Semihereditary orders, Hereditary orders, Extremal orders, Maximal orders, Azumaya algebras, Dubrovin valuation rings.
2010 MSC: 13F30, 16E60, 16H05, 16H10, 16S35

1. Introduction

This work is about orders in a crossed-product F-algebra $(K/F, G, f)$ which are integral over their center V, a valuation ring of the field F, and generalizes the results obtained in [4, 12, 13, 25]. Whereas in [4, 12, 13] the valuation ring V is unramified in K, and in [4, 12, 25] V is a discrete valuation ring (DVR), we seldomly make such assumptions in this paper. Further, our theory complements and enhances the classical theory of crossed-product orders over valuation rings, such as can be found in [6, 23], in two significant ways: firstly, we do not require that the valuation ring V should be a DVR, as mentioned above; secondly, we do not require that the values of the two-cocycles associated with our crossed-product orders should be multiplicative units in the integral

J. Algebra 402 (2014) 319-350

closure of V in K. We shall give a precise description of the crossed-product orders we will be dealing with shortly.

If R is a ring, then $J(R)$ will denote its Jacobson radical, $Z(R)$ its center, $U(R)$ its group of multiplicative units, and $R^{\#}$ the subset of all the non-zero elements. The residue ring $R/J(R)$ will be denoted by $\overline{R}$. Given the ring R, it is called *primary* if $J(R)$ is a maximal ideal of R. It is called *hereditary* if one-sided ideals are projective R-modules. It is called *semihereditary* (respectively *Bézout*) if finitely generated one-sided ideals are projective R-modules (respectively are principal). Let V be a valuation ring of a field F. If Q is a finite-dimensional central simple F-algebra, then a subring R of Q is called an order in Q if $RF = Q$. If in addition $V \subseteq R$ and R is integral over V, then R is called a V-order. If a V-order R is maximal among the V-orders of Q with respect to inclusion, then R is called a *maximal V-order* (or just a *maximal order* if the context is clear). A V-order R of Q is called an *extremal* V-order (or simply *extremal* when the context is clear) if for every V-order B in Q with $B \supseteq R$ and $J(B) \supseteq J(R)$, we have $B = R$. If R is an order in Q then, since it is a PI-ring, it is called a *Dubrovin valuation ring* of Q (or a *valuation ring* of Q in short) if it is semihereditary and primary (see [2]).

In this paper, V will denote a commutative valuation domain of *arbitrary* Krull dimension (rank). Let F be its field of quotients, let K/F be a finite Galois extension with group G, and let S be the integral closure of V in K. If $f \in Z^2(G, U(K))$ is a normalized two-cocycle such that $f(G \times G) \subseteq S^{\#}$, then one can construct a "crossed-product" V-algebra

$$A_f = \sum_{\sigma \in G} S x_\sigma,$$

with the usual rules of multiplication: $x_\sigma s x_\tau = \sigma(s) f(\sigma, \tau) x_{\sigma\tau}$ for $s \in S$, $\sigma, \tau \in G$. Then A_f is associative, with identity $1 = x_1$, and center $V = V x_1$. Further, A_f is a V-order in the crossed-product F-algebra $\Sigma_f = \sum_{\sigma \in G} K x_\sigma = (K/F, G, f)$.

Two such cocycles f and g are said to be cohomologous over S (respectively cohomologous over K), denoted by $f \sim_S g$ (respectively $f \sim_K g$), if there are elements $\{c_\sigma \mid \sigma \in G\} \subseteq U(S)$ (respectively $\{c_\sigma \mid \sigma \in G\} \subseteq K^{\#}$) such that $g(\sigma, \tau) = c_\sigma \sigma(c_\tau) c_{\sigma\tau}^{-1} f(\sigma, \tau)$ for all $\sigma, \tau \in G$. Following [4], let $H = \{\sigma \in G \mid f(\sigma, \sigma^{-1}) \in U(S)\} = \{\sigma \in G \mid x_\sigma \in U(A_f)\}$. Then H is a subgroup of G. On G/H, the left coset space of G by H, one can define a partial ordering by the rule $\sigma H \leq \tau H$ if $f(\sigma, \sigma^{-1}\tau) \in U(S)$. Then "$\leq$" is well-defined, and depends only on the cohomology class of f over S. Further, H is the unique least element. We call this partial ordering on G/H *the graph of* f and in this paper we will denote it by $\mathrm{Gr}(f)$.

Such a setup was first formulated by Haile in [4], with the assumption that V is a DVR unramified in K, wherein, among other things, conditions equivalent to such orders being maximal orders were considered. Since we do not require that $H = G$, A_f is a so-called "weak" crossed-product order, but we shall abuse the terminology and refer to it simply as a crossed-product order. These are the

crossed-product orders we will investigate in this paper, *without* the assumption that V is a DVR unramified in K.

It is worth making the following two observations. First, let $g \in Z^2(G, U(K))$ be an *arbitrary* normalized two-cocycle with values not necessarily in $S^{\#}$ and let $(K/F, G, g) = \sum_{\sigma \in G} K u_\sigma$ be a crossed-product F-algebra with respect to g. We can choose a $t \in V^{\#}$ such that, for every $\sigma, \tau \in G$, we have $tg(\sigma, \tau) \in S^{\#}$. Now let $x_1 = u_1 = 1$ and, for $\sigma \neq 1$, let $x_\sigma = tu_\sigma$. Then $x_\sigma x_\tau = f(\sigma, \tau) x_{\sigma\tau}$ where f is a normalized two-cocycle satisfying $f(G \times G) \subseteq S^{\#}$, and we have $(K/F, G, g) = \sum_{\sigma \in G} K x_\sigma \supseteq A_f$. Thus the crossed-product orders under consideration in this paper occur quite naturally as V-orders *in every crossed-product F-algebra.* Second, let us assume for the moment that V is not necessarily a valuation ring, but just a commutative domain whose quotient field is F. Then $A = A_f$ would still be an order in Σ_f integral over V. Therefore if A is semihereditary then by [15, Theorem 1.3] V would be a Prüfer domain, that is, a (commutative) semihereditary domain. But by [18, Lemma 2.2] A is semihereditary if and only if A_m is semihereditary for each maximal ideal m of V, where A_m denotes the central localization at m. Since our interest in this paper is in crossed-product orders that are at least semihereditary, it is no restriction to assume that V is a valuation ring of F.

Our valuation theoretic terminology will be consistent with that of [3]. If U is a valuation ring of a field L, we will denote its value group by Γ_U. Let M be a maximal ideal of S. Then $e(S_M \mid F) := [\Gamma_{S_M} : \Gamma_V]$ is called the ramification index of S_M over F. The extension K/F is said to be *defectless* if $[K : F] = e(S_M|F)[\overline{S}_M : \overline{V}]r$, where r is the number of maximal ideals of S. The extension K/F is said to be *tamely ramified* if $\mathrm{Char}(\overline{V})$ does not divide $e(S_M|F)$ and $\overline{S}_M$ is separable over $\overline{V}$. The extension is called *unramified* if $e(S_M|F) = 1$ and $\overline{S}_M$ is separable over $\overline{V}$. We let $G^Z(S_M|F) = \{\sigma \in G \mid \sigma(S_M) \subseteq S_M\}$, the decomposition group of S_M over F, and we denote its fixed field, called the decomposition field, by $K^Z(S_M|F)$. We let $G^T(S_M|F) = \{\sigma \in G \mid \sigma(x) - x \in J(S_M) \forall x \in S_M\}$, the inertial group of S_M over F, and we denote its fixed field, called the inertia field, by $K^T(S_M|F)$. Since K, F, G, S, V, and M will be fixed in this paper, we shall merely refer to $G^Z(S_M|F)$ as G^Z, $G^T(S_M|F)$ as G^T, and so on, if there is no danger of confusion.

Let $\overline{p} = \max(1, \mathrm{Char}(\overline{V}))$, the *characteristic exponent* of $\overline{V}$. Since K/F is a Galois extension, by [10, Lemma 1], K/F is tamely ramified and defectless if and only if $\gcd(\overline{p}, |G^T|) = 1$, and K/F is unramified and defectless if and only if $|G^T| = 1$.

Let L be an intermediate field of F and K, let G_L be the Galois group of K over L, let U be a valuation ring of L lying over V, and let T be the integral closure of U in K. Then one can obtain a two-cocycle $f_{L,U} : G_L \times G_L \mapsto T^{\#}$ from f by restricting f to $G_L \times G_L$, and embedding $S^{\#}$ in $T^{\#}$. As before, $A_{f_{L,U}} = \sum_{\sigma \in G_L} T x_\sigma$ is a U-order in $\Sigma_{f_{L,U}} = \sum_{\sigma \in G_L} K x_\sigma = (K/L, G_L, f_{L,U})$. If M is a maximal ideal of S and $U = K^Z \cap S_M$, then we will denote $f_{K^Z,U}$ by f_M, $A_{f_{K^Z,U}}$ by A_{f_M}, and $\Sigma_{f_{K^Z,U}}$ by Σ_{f_M}, following [4]. Further, we let $H_M = \{\sigma \in G^Z \mid f_M(\sigma, \sigma^{-1}) \notin M\}$, a subgroup of G^Z. On the other hand,

if $U = K^T \cap S_M$, then we will denote $f_{K^T,U}$ by $f_{(M)}$, $A_{f_{K^T,U}}$ by $A_{f_{(M)}}$, and $\Sigma_{f_{K^T,U}}$ by $\Sigma_{f_{(M)}}$.

In Section 2, we describe the graded Jacobson radical of A_f explicitly based on an argument of Haile [4], and characterize semihereditary and Dubrovin crossed-product orders when $J(V)$ is not a principal ideal of V. We also introduce the notion of a graph of $[f]_M$, denoted by $\mathrm{Gr}(f^M)$, where M is a maximal ideal of S, and give a sufficient condition for it to be a chain. The graph $\mathrm{Gr}(f^M)$ seems to be a useful alternative to the graph $\mathrm{Gr}(f)$ when V decomposes in K. The two graphs coincide when V is indecomposed in K.

In Section 3, we assume for the most part that the extension K/F is tamely ramified and defectless. With this assumption, we give an explicit description of the Jacobson radical of A_f, generalizing [4, Proposition 3.1(b)] and [25, Theorem 4.3]. When V is a DVR unramified and indecomposed in K, Haile [4, Theorem 2.3] showed that A_f is a hereditary order (actually a maximal order in this case since it is primary) if and only if H is a normal subgroup of G with cyclic quotient and, if $H \neq G$, then the graph $\mathrm{Gr}(f)$ is the chain

$$H \leq \sigma H \leq \sigma^2 H \leq \cdots \leq \sigma^{|G/H|-1} H$$

for some $\sigma \in G$ satisfying: 1) $G/H = \langle \sigma H \rangle$, 2) $f(\sigma, \sigma^{-1}) \in J(S) \setminus J(S)^2$, and 3) $J(A_f) = x_\sigma A_f$. Wilson [25, Theorem 2.15] extended this result to the case when V is a DVR tamely ramified and indecomposed in K. He also showed that, under this assumption, $G^T \subseteq H$ whenever A_f is hereditary. We extend these results to an arbitrary valuation ring V when $J(V)$ is a principal ideal of V. We provide various other characterizations of semihereditary crossed-product orders in this section when V is not necessarily indecomposed in K, generalizing results in [12, 13]. We end the section by generalizing two classical results, one by Auslander and Rim and the other by Harada, and we also complete the characterization of the so-called "hereditary global crossed product orders" introduced in [14].

In Section 4, we characterize Dubrovin crossed-product orders under the assumption that K/F is tamely ramified and defectless. Assuming V is a DVR unramified in K, it was shown in [4] that A_f is primary if and only if given a maximal ideal M of S, there exists a set of right coset representatives $\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \ldots, \sigma_r$ of G^Z in G that is "nice" in the sense that $f(\sigma_i, \sigma_i^{-1}) \notin M$ for all i. We generalize this result in this section. We also reduce the problem of determining when the crossed-product order A_f is a valuation ring of Σ_f to the case when K/F is tame totally ramified and $H = G$.

In Section 5, we take a closer look at the connections between the various graphs encountered in this paper. If M is a maximal ideal of S, we show that the "nice" set of right coset representatives of G^Z in G mentioned above exists precisely when a certain graph isomorphism exists between $\mathrm{Gr}(f_M)$ and $\mathrm{Gr}(f^M)$. Just as in [4], we show that the existence of a "nice" set of right coset representatives with respect to one maximal ideal of S implies the existence of a "nice" set of right coset representatives for all the maximal ideals of S, and this is *not* premised on the fact that V is tamely ramified or defectless in K.

As pointed out in [13], the behavior of the crossed-product order A_f when $J(V)$ is a principal ideal of V is very similar to its behavior when V is a DVR. This is a recurrent theme throughout this paper. The recent PhD thesis of Chris Wilson [24], part of which appears in [25], covers the case when V is a DVR tamely ramified in K very well. Some of the arguments in [25] will be useful in this paper.

2. Preliminaries and Generalities

Strictly speaking, A_f is not a crossed-product of G over S, but rather a G-graded ring. Therefore, following [19], if G_1 is a subgroup of G, we will let $S(G_1) = \sum_{\sigma \in G_1} Sx_\sigma$. Note that $S(G) = A_f$ and, if L is the fixed field of G_1, then $S(G_1)$ is an order in the crossed-product L-algebra $K(G_1) = (K/L, G_1, f_{|_{G_1 \times G_1}})$.

A ring is said to be *coherent* if finitely generated one-sided ideals are finitely presented. If R is a ring, wgld(R) will denote its *weak global dimension* (see [16] for the definition).

Part (1) of the following lemma is known when $H = G$ (see the proof of [26, Theorem 3.2]).

Lemma 2.1. *Let G_1 be a subgroup of G. Then:*

1. *$S(G_1)$ is a coherent ring. Consequently,*
2. *A_f is semihereditary if and only if $J(A_f)$ is a flat A_f-module, and*
3. *$S(G_1)$ is semihereditary if and only if wgld$(S(G_1)) \leq 1$.*

Proof. Let $I = \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i S(G_1)$ be a finitely generated right ideal of $S(G_1)$. Let $S(G_1)^{(n)}$ denote the right $S(G_1)$-module which is the external direct sum of n copies of $S(G_1)$, and consider the $S(G_1)$-epimorphism

$$\phi : S(G_1)^{(n)} \mapsto I : (x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n) \mapsto \sum_i a_i x_i.$$

We will show that $\ker \phi$ is finitely generated over $S(G_1)$. Observe that $S(G_1)$ is a free S-module of finite rank, I is a finitely generated S-submodule, and S is a semihereditary ring. So I must be a projective S-module [21, Proposition 4.30], and $\ker \phi$ a finitely generated S-module by Schanuel's Lemma. Hence $\ker \phi$ is a finitely generated $S(G_1)$-module as claimed. In the same manner, one can show that every finitely generated left ideal of $S(G_1)$ is finitely presented, hence $S(G_1)$ is a coherent ring. Part (2) now follows from [15, Theorem 2.7]; as for part (3), see for instance [21, Example 8.20(iii)]. □

If $h \in H$ then, since $f^h(h^{-1}, h\sigma)f(h, \sigma) = f(h, h^{-1})$ and $f^\sigma(h, h^{-1}) = f(\sigma, h)f(\sigma h, h^{-1})$, we see that $f(h, \sigma), f(\sigma, h) \in U(S)$ for every $\sigma \in G$ (cf. [4, Lemma 3.5]).

Lemma 2.2. *Let G_1 be a subgroup of G such that $G_1 \subseteq H$. Then:*

1. *wgld$(S(G_1)) \leq$ wgld(A_f).*

2. *If A_f is semihereditary, then $S(G_1)$ is semihereditary.*
3. *Let L be the fixed field of G_1, and let U be a valuation ring of L lying over V. If A_f is semihereditary, then $A_{f_{L,U}}$ is semihereditary.*

Proof. First, we will show that A_f is a free right $S(G_1)$-module. If $\sigma \in G_1$, let $S(\sigma G_1) = \sum_{\gamma \in G_1} Sx_{\sigma\gamma}$, a right $S(G_1)$-module. Since $G_1 \subseteq H$, $f(\sigma, \gamma) \in U(S)$ for every $\gamma \in G_1$, hence $S(\sigma G_1) = x_\sigma S(G_1)$, a free $S(G_1)$-module with basis $\{x_\sigma\}$. In particular, A_f is a free right $S(G_1)$-module of finite rank: if $\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \ldots, \sigma_r$ are left coset representatives of G_1 in G, then $A_f = \sum_i S(\sigma_i G_1)$ (direct sum). Because $S(G_1)$ is an $S(G_1)$-bimodule direct summand of A_f, by [16, Theorem 7.2.8(ii)] we conclude that $\mathrm{wgld}(S(G_1)) \leq \mathrm{wgld}(A_f)$ (cf. [26, Lemma 2.1(ii)]). Therefore, if A_f is semihereditary, then $S(G_1)$ is also semihereditary by Lemma 2.1. Since $S(G_1) \subseteq A_{f_{L,U}} \subseteq \Sigma_{f_{L,U}}$, if $S(G_1)$ is semihereditary, so is $A_{f_{L,U}}$, by [17, Lemma 4.10]. □

Recall that $J(V)$ is not a principal ideal of V if and only if $J(V)^2 = J(V)$. When this happens, $M^2 = M$ for every maximal ideal M of S.

For a $\sigma \in G$, here and elsewhere we will let $I_\sigma = \bigcap M$, where the intersection is taken over those maximal ideals M of S for which $f(\sigma, \sigma^{-1}) \notin M$.

Lemma 2.3. *(cf. [13, Lemma 2.4]) Given a $\sigma \in G$, then:*

1. $I_\sigma = \{x \in S \mid xf(\sigma, \sigma^{-1}) \in J(S)\}$.
2. $\sigma^{-1}(I_\sigma) = I_{\sigma^{-1}}$.
3. *If $f(\sigma, \sigma^{-1}) \notin M^2$ for every maximal ideal M of S, then $I_\sigma f(\sigma, \sigma^{-1}) = J(S)$.*
4. *$\sum_{\sigma \in G} I_\sigma x_\sigma$ is an ideal of A_f.*
5. *$I_\sigma \subseteq J(S)$ if and only if $\sigma \in H$. When this occurs, $I_\sigma = J(S)$.*

Proof. Let $x \in S$. Clearly, if $x \in I_\sigma$ then $xf(\sigma, \sigma^{-1}) \in J(S)$. On the other hand, if $x \notin I_\sigma$ then there exists a maximal ideal M of S such that $x, f(\sigma, \sigma^{-1}) \notin M$, hence $xf(\sigma, \sigma^{-1}) \notin M$, and thus $xf(\sigma, \sigma^{-1}) \notin J(S)$.

The second statement is proved in the same manner as [12, Sublemma]. To see that the third statement holds, we note that $I_\sigma f(\sigma, \sigma^{-1}) \subseteq J(S)$. We claim that $I_\sigma f(\sigma, \sigma^{-1}) = J(S)$. If $J(V)$ is not a principal ideal of V then the assumption implies that $f(\sigma, \sigma^{-1}) \in U(S)$, hence the conclusion holds. To see that the conclusion also holds when $J(V)$ is a principal ideal of V, let M be a maximal ideal of S. If $f(\sigma, \sigma^{-1}) \notin M$, then $(I_\sigma f(\sigma, \sigma^{-1}))S_M = J(S_M) = J(S)S_M$. On the other hand, if $f(\sigma, \sigma^{-1}) \in M$ then, since $f(\sigma, \sigma^{-1}) \notin M^2$, we have $J(S_M)^2 \subsetneq I_\sigma f(\sigma, \sigma^{-1})S_M \subseteq J(S_M)$, hence $I_\sigma f(\sigma, \sigma^{-1})S_M = J(S_M) = J(S)S_M$, and thus $I_\sigma f(\sigma, \sigma^{-1}) = J(S)$.

The argument in [4, Proposition 3.1] now shows that indeed, $\sum_{\sigma \in G} I_\sigma x_\sigma$ is an ideal of A_f.

Finally, observe that $I_\sigma \subseteq J(S)$ implies that $I_\sigma \subseteq M$ for every maximal ideal M of S, and hence $f(\sigma, \sigma^{-1}) \in U(S)$. The converse also holds. □

Let $J_G(A_f)$ denote the *graded Jacobson radical* of A_f (see [19] for the definition). By [19, Theorem 4.12], we always have $J(V)A_f \subseteq J(S)A_f \subseteq J_G(A_f) \subseteq J(A_f)$. We are now going to give an explicit description of $J_G(A_f)$.

Proposition 2.4. *We always have* $J_G(A_f) = \sum_{\sigma \in G} I_\sigma x_\sigma$.

Proof. Let $I = \sum_{\sigma \in G} I_\sigma x_\sigma$, an ideal of A_f by Lemma 2.3(4) . The argument by Haile in [4, Proposition 3.1(b)] is easily adaptable to this situation to establish that I is the largest G-graded ideal of A_f contained in $J(A_f)$. Hence by [19, Theorem 4.12], $I = J_G(A_f)$. □

Theorem 2.5. *The crossed-product order A_f is Azumaya over V if and only if $H = G$, and K/F is unramified and defectless.*

Proof. Suppose A_f is Azumaya over V. Then $J(A_f) = J(V)A_f$, hence $J_G(A_f) = J(V)A_f$ and $I_\sigma = J(V)S \subseteq J(S)$ for every $\sigma \in G$. This shows that $H = G$ by Lemma 2.3(5). The theorem now follows from [10, Theorem 3]. □

Theorem 2.6. *Suppose $J(V)$ is not a principal ideal of V.*

1. *The crossed-product order A_f is an extremal V-order precisely when it is a maximal V-order.*
2. *The following are equivalent:*
   (a) *A_f is semihereditary.*
   (b) *A_f is a semihereditary maximal V-order.*
   (c) *$J(A_f) = J(V)A_f$.*

   When this happens, $H = G$ and $J(A_f) = J_G(A_f)$.
3. *Suppose A_f is semihereditary. Then $A_{f_{L,U}}$ is a semihereditary order in $\Sigma_{f_{L,U}}$ for each intermediate field L of F and K, and every valuation ring U of L lying over V.*
4. *A_f is a valuation ring of Σ_f if and only if $J(V)A_f$ is a maximal ideal of A_f.*
5. *Suppose K/F is tamely ramified and defectless. Then A_f is semihereditary if and only if $H = G$, if and only if $f(\sigma, \tau) \notin M^2$ for every maximal ideal M of S and every $\sigma, \tau \in G$.*
6. *If $\overline{V}$ is a perfect field, then A_f is semihereditary if and only if $H = G$ and K/F is tamely ramified and defectless.*

Proof. (1) Suppose A_f is an extremal V-order. Let B be a V-order in Σ_f containing A_f. Since A_f is extremal, $J(B) \subseteq A_f$, by [8, Proposition 1.4]. Let $t = \sum_{\sigma \in G} a_\sigma x_\sigma \in B$, with $a_\sigma \in K$. Then $a_\sigma J(V) \subseteq S$, since $J(V) \subseteq J(B) \subseteq A_f$ and so $tJ(V) \subseteq A_f$. Since $J(V)^2 = J(V)$, we see that $a_\sigma J(V) \subseteq J(V)S$. Thus, if M is a maximal ideal of S, then $a_\sigma J(S_M) \subseteq J(S_M)$, hence $a_\sigma \in S_M$ for all maximal ideals M of A. Therefore $a_\sigma \in S$ and $B = A_f$, and so A_f is a maximal V-order in Σ_f.

(2) If A_f is a semihereditary V-order, then it is an extremal V-order by [8, Theorem 1.5]. Hence A_f is a semihereditary maximal order, and $J(A_f) = J(V)A_f$ by [9, Corollary 1], since $J(V)$ is not a principal ideal of V.

Now suppose $J(A_f) = J(V)A_f$. We will show that A_f is semihereditary. Observe that in this case $J(A_f)$ is the ascending union of projective ideals $\{vA_f \mid v \in J(V)\}$. Therefore $J(A_f)$ is a flat A_f-module, hence A_f is semihereditary by Lemma 2.1.

When A_f is semihereditary, then $J(A_f) = J(V)A_f$, hence $J(A_f) = J_G(A_f)$ and $I_\sigma = J(V)S$ for every $\sigma \in G$. It follows that $H = G$.

(3) Let $G_1 = \mathrm{Gal}(K/L)$. Suppose A_f is semihereditary. Then $G_1 \subseteq G = H$, hence the result follows from Lemma 2.2.

(4) If A_f is a valuation ring of Σ_f, then it is semihereditary and $J(A_f)$ is a maximal ideal of A_f. Since A_f is semihereditary, $J(A_f) = J(V)A_f$. Conversely, if $J(V)A_f$ is a maximal ideal of A_f, then $J(A_f) = J(V)A_f$, and A_f is a semihereditary primary order in Σ_f, hence it is a valuation ring of Σ_f.

(5) If A_f is semihereditary, then $H = G$, as we have seen above. On the other hand, if $f(\sigma,\tau) \notin M^2$ for every maximal ideal M of S, then $f(\sigma,\tau) \notin J(S_M)^2$ for every maximal ideal M of S. Since $J(V)^2 = J(V)$, $J(S_M)^2 = J(S_M)$, hence $f(\sigma,\tau) \in U(S_M)$ for every maximal ideal M of S, and so $f(\sigma,\tau) \in U(S)$. The result now follows from [10, Theorem 2(a)].

(6) Suppose $\overline{V}$ is a perfect field. If A_f is semihereditary then $H = G$ and, from [10, Theorem 2(b)], K/F is tamely ramified and defectless. On the other hand, if $H = G$ and K/F is tamely ramified and defectless, then A_f is semihereditary by [10, Theorem 2(a)].

□

Fix a maximal ideal M of S. The relation on G/H given by $\sigma H \leq_M \tau H$ if $f(\sigma,\sigma^{-1}\tau) \notin M$ is well defined and, since

$$f(\sigma,\sigma^{-1}\tau)f(\tau,\tau^{-1}\gamma) = f^\sigma(\sigma^{-1}\tau,\tau^{-1}\gamma)f(\sigma,\sigma^{-1}\gamma),$$

it is a preorder on G/H (see [4, Proposition 3.3(a)]). Hence $\leq_M$ induces an equivalence relation on G/H in the usual manner: σH is equivalent to τH if $\sigma H \leq_M \tau H$ and $\tau H \leq_M \sigma H$. Further, $\leq_M$ induces a partial ordering on the set of the equivalence classes thus formed. We shall call the partial ordering on the equivalence classes *the graph of* $[f]_M$ and we will denote it by $\mathrm{Gr}(f^M)$. We will denote the equivalence class containing σH by $[\sigma]_M$ and, abusing notation, we shall say $[\sigma]_M \leq_M [\tau]_M$ if $\sigma H \leq_M \tau H$. Observe that the graph $\mathrm{Gr}(f^M)$ is rooted at $[1]_M$.

The following lemma was originally proved by Wilson when V is a DVR indecomposed in K [25, Lemma 2.7]. The same argument holds in general:

Lemma 2.7. *Let $\sigma,\tau \in G$. If v_M is a valuation on K corresponding to the maximal ideal M of S, then $v_M(f(\sigma,\sigma^{-1})) \leq v_M(f(\tau,\tau^{-1}))$ whenever $\sigma H \leq_M \tau H$.*

Proof. This follows from the cocycle identity

$$f^\sigma(\sigma^{-1}\tau,\tau^{-1})f(\sigma,\sigma^{-1}) = f(\sigma,\sigma^{-1}\tau)f(\tau,\tau^{-1}).$$

□

If I is an additive subgroup of Σ_f, we will let $O_l(I) = \{x \in \Sigma_f \mid xI \subseteq I\}$. We observe that, if $J(V)$ is a principal ideal of V and I is an ideal of A_f containing $J(V)$, then I is finitely generated over A_f: $I/J(V)A_f$ is finitely

generated over $\overline{V}$, hence there are elements $a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_m \in I$ such that $I = a_1V + a_2V + \cdots + a_mV + J(V)A_f$, a finitely generated ideal of A_f since $J(V)$ is a principal ideal of V. In the same manner, if I is an ideal of S containing $J(V)$ then I is a finitely generated ideal of S.

The following result is quite consequential; in fact, [12, Theorem] follows from it.

Theorem 2.8. *Suppose $J(V)$ is a principal ideal of V. Given the crossed-product order A_f, then $O_l(J_G(A_f)) = A_f$ if and only if $f(\sigma, \sigma^{-1}) \notin M^2$ for every $\sigma \in G$ and each maximal ideal M of S; if and only if $f(\sigma, \tau) \notin M^2$ for every $\sigma, \tau \in G$ and each maximal ideal M of S.*

Proof. Suppose that $O_l(J_G(A_f)) = A_f$. Fix a maximal ideal M of S. We will first show that $f(\tau, \tau^{-1}) \notin M^2$ for every $\tau \in G$. By Lemma 2.7, it suffices to show that $f(\sigma, \sigma^{-1}) \notin M^2$ whenever $[\sigma]_M$ is a maximal element with respect to the partial ordering discussed above. So assume $[\sigma]_M$ is a maximal vertex of $\mathrm{Gr}(f^M)$.

Observe that, since $M \supseteq J(S) \supseteq J(V)$, both M and $J(S)$ are finitely generated ideals of S. Hence they are principal ideals, say $M = rS$ and $J(S) = \pi_S S$, since S is a Bézout domain. If on the contrary $f(\sigma, \sigma^{-1}) \in M^2$, we let $a = \pi_S / r^2$ and $x = ax_\sigma$. Then $a \notin S$, since $a \notin S_M$. Hence $x \notin A_f$.

Fix $\tau \in G$. We want to show that $xI_\tau x_\tau \subseteq I_{\sigma\tau} x_{\sigma\tau}$.

Suppose $f(\sigma, \tau) \notin M$ and $f^\sigma(\tau, \tau^{-1}) \in M$. Since $f(\sigma, \sigma^{-1}(\sigma\tau)) = f(\sigma, \tau) \notin M$, we have $\sigma H \leq_M \sigma\tau H$, and thus $\sigma\tau H \leq_M \sigma H$ by the choice of σ. But $f^\sigma(\tau, \tau^{-1}) \in M$ and $f^\sigma(\tau, \tau^{-1}) = f(\sigma, \tau) f(\sigma\tau, \tau^{-1})$. Since $f(\sigma, \tau) \notin M$, we conclude that $f(\sigma\tau, \tau^{-1}) \in M$. But $f(\sigma\tau, \tau^{-1}) = f(\sigma\tau, (\sigma\tau)^{-1}\sigma)$ and thus $\sigma\tau H \not\leq_M \sigma H$, a contradiction.

Therefore $f(\sigma, \tau) \in M$ or $f(\tau, \tau^{-1}) \notin M^{\sigma^{-1}}$, and hence $I_\tau^\sigma f(\sigma, \tau) \subseteq M$. This implies that $aI_\tau^\sigma f(\sigma, \tau) \subseteq S$.

We have

$$\begin{aligned} (aI_\tau^\sigma f(\sigma, \tau)) f(\sigma\tau, (\sigma\tau)^{-1}) &= aI_\tau^\sigma f^\sigma(\tau, \tau^{-1}\sigma^{-1}) f(\sigma, \sigma^{-1}) \\ &= \pi_S (f(\sigma, \sigma^{-1})/r^2) I_\tau^\sigma f^\sigma(\tau, \tau^{-1}\sigma^{-1}) \\ &\subseteq J(S). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore $aI_\tau^\sigma f(\sigma, \tau) \subseteq I_{\sigma\tau}$ by Lemma 2.3(1), hence $xI_\tau x_\tau = aI_\tau^\sigma f(\sigma, \tau) x_{\sigma\tau} \subseteq I_{\sigma\tau} x_{\sigma\tau} \subseteq J_G(A_f)$. Thus $x \in O_l(J_G(A_f)) = A_f$, a contradiction.

We conclude that $f(\tau, \tau^{-1}) \notin M^2$ for every $\tau \in G$ and each maximal ideal M of S. From the cocycle identity $f^\sigma(\sigma^{-1}, \sigma\tau) f(\sigma, \tau) = f(\sigma, \sigma^{-1})$, it follows that $f(\sigma, \tau) \notin M^2$ for every $\sigma, \tau \in G$, and each maximal ideal M of S.

Suppose $f(\sigma, \sigma^{-1}) \notin M^2$ for every $\sigma \in G$ and each maximal ideal M of S. Let $x = \sum_{\tau \in G} k_\tau x_\tau \in O_l(J_G(A_f))$ with $k_\tau \in K$. Fix a maximal ideal M of S and let v_M be a valuation on K corresponding to M. Observe that if $J(S) = \pi_S S$, then $v_M(\pi_S)$ is the smallest positive element of the value group of v_M hence, if $k \in K$ satisfies $v_M(k) > -v_M(\pi_S)$ then $v_M(k) \geq 0$. Now fix a $\sigma \in G$. The hypothesis implies that $v_M(f(\sigma, \sigma^{-1})) \leq v_M(\pi_S)$. We will show that $v_M(k_\sigma) \geq 0$.

If $f(\sigma,\sigma^{-1}) \in M$ then, since $k_\sigma f(\sigma,\sigma^{-1})I_\sigma = k_\sigma x_\sigma I_{\sigma^{-1}} x_{\sigma^{-1}} \subseteq I_1 = J(S) \subseteq M$ by Lemma 2.3(2), we have $v_M(k_\sigma f(\sigma,\sigma^{-1})) > 0$ as $I_\sigma \not\subseteq M$. Hence $v_M(k_\sigma) > -v_M(f(\sigma,\sigma^{-1})) \geq -v_M(\pi_S)$ and so $v_M(k_\sigma) \geq 0$.

On the other hand, if $f(\sigma,\sigma^{-1}) \notin M$ then $I_\sigma \subseteq M$. Since $J(S)A_f \subseteq J_G(A_f)$, we have $\sigma^{-1}(\pi_S) \in J_G(A_f)$, hence $x\sigma^{-1}(\pi_S) \in J_G(A_f)$ and therefore $k_\sigma \pi_S \in I_\sigma$. Then $v_M(k_\sigma\pi_S) > 0$ hence $v_M(k_\sigma) \geq 0$ and so $k_\sigma \in S$ and $x \in A_f$. □

Corollary 2.9. *Suppose $J(V)$ is a principal ideal of V and the crossed-product order A_f is a maximal V-order in Σ_f. Then $f(\sigma,\tau) \notin M^2$ for every $\sigma,\tau \in G$, and each maximal ideal M of S.*

Proof. We note that $O_l(J_G(A_f))$ is a V-order in Σ_f, by [8, Corollary 1.3]. Since $O_l(J_G(A_f)) \supseteq A_f$ and A_f is a maximal order, we must have equality: $O_l(J_G(A_f)) = A_f$. □

The following proposition has analogies in [4, Theorem 2.3(3)], and in a result by Wilson which we shall generalize in Theorem 3.2 in the next section. In either case, V was a DVR indecomposed in K. The approach we have taken below is essentially due to Wilson.

Proposition 2.10. *Given the crossed-product order A_f, suppose $f(\sigma,\tau) \notin M^2$ for every $\sigma,\tau \in G$ and each maximal ideal M of S. Then for each maximal ideal M of S, the graph $Gr(f^M)$ is a chain.*

Proof. Let M be a maximal ideal of S, and let $\sigma,\tau \in G$. Write $\sigma = \tau\gamma$. We have $f(\tau,\gamma)f(\tau\gamma,\gamma^{-1}) = f^\tau(\gamma,\gamma^{-1})$. Since $f(\gamma,\gamma^{-1}) \notin (M^{\tau^{-1}})^2 = (M^2)^{\tau^{-1}}$, we have $f(\tau,\gamma)f(\tau\gamma,\gamma^{-1}) \notin M^2$. Therefore $f(\tau,\tau^{-1}(\tau\gamma)) = f(\tau,\gamma) \notin M$ or $f(\tau\gamma,(\tau\gamma)^{-1}\tau) = f(\tau\gamma,\gamma^{-1}) \notin M$, hence $\tau H \leq_M \tau\gamma H = \sigma H$, or $\sigma H = \tau\gamma H \leq_M \tau H$, so that the graph of $[f]_M$ is totally ordered. □

The converse of the statement above is false (see [12, Example]).

Remark 2.11. When $J(V)$ is a non-principal ideal of V and A_f is semihereditary, then $H = G$ by Theorem 2.6, hence for each maximal ideal M of S the graph of $[f]_M$ is trivial. If $J(V)$ is a principal ideal of V, then an example of a semihereditary order A_f for which the graph of $[f]_M$ is not a chain for some maximal ideal M of S would be interesting. Obviously A_f cannot be a maximal order and we cannot have $H = G$. As we shall see in the next chapter, the extension K/F cannot be tamely ramified and defectless either. Thus the evidence points to a very pathological scenario indeed, and it may well not exist at all!

Also, characterizing all crossed-product orders A_f for which the graph of $[f]_M$ is a chain for each maximal ideal M of S would in itself be a worthwhile undertaking.

Unlike in the case of classical crossed-product orders (see for example [6, Theorem 1]), the fact that A_{f_M} or $A_{f_{(M)}}$ is semihereditary for some maximal ideal M of S does not alone guarantee that A_f is semihereditary (see [12, Example]). However we have the following affirmative result, but first we need more notation.

Given a maximal ideal M of S, let $M = M_1, M_2, \ldots, M_r$ be the complete list of maximal ideals of S, let $U_i = S_{M_i} \cap K^Z(S_{M_i}|F)$ with $U = U_1$, and let (K_i, S_i) be a Henselization of (K, S_{M_i}) (see [3, §17] for a definition). Let (F_h, V_h) be the unique Henselization of (F, V) contained in (K_1, S_1) (see [3, Theorem 17.11]). We note that (F_h, V_h) is also a Henselization of (K^Z, U). By [5, Proposition 11], we have $S \otimes_V V_h \cong S_1 \oplus S_2 \oplus \cdots \oplus S_r$.

Proposition 2.12. *Suppose the crossed-product order A_f is semihereditary (respectively a valuation ring of Σ_f). Then A_{f_M} is a semihereditary order (respectively a valuation ring of Σ_{f_M}) for each maximal ideal M of S.*

Proof. If A_f is semihereditary then its Henselization, $A_f \otimes_V V_h$, is also semihereditary by [8, Theorem 3.4]. Since $S \otimes_V V_h \subseteq A_f \otimes_V V_h$, if e is the multiplicative identity of S_1 then e is an idempotent of $A_f \otimes_V V_h$, hence $e(A_f \otimes_V V_h)e = \sum_{\sigma \in G^Z} S_1 x_\sigma \cong A_{f_M} \otimes_U V_h$ is semihereditary. This shows that A_{f_M} is semihereditary by [8, Theorem 3.4]. On the other hand, if A_f is a valuation ring of Σ_f then $A_f \otimes_V V_h$ is a valuation ring of $\Sigma_f \otimes_F F_h$ by [22, Theorem F], hence $e(A_f \otimes_V V_h)e$ is a valuation ring of $\Sigma_{f_M} \otimes_{K^Z} F_h$ by [2, §1, Theorem 7]. This shows that A_{f_M} is a valuation ring of Σ_{f_M}. □

The converse of the proposition above does not always hold (see [12, Example]). In Section 5 we shall encounter a sufficient condition for the converse to hold. The author suspects that, if M is a maximal ideal of S and A_f is semihereditary, then $S(G_1)$ is semihereditary for each subgroup G_1 of G contained in $G^Z(S_M|F)$. If that was indeed the case, then $A_{f(M)}$ too would be semihereditary whenever A_f is semihereditary.

Proposition 2.13. *Suppose S is finitely generated over V. Then:*

1. *The crossed-product order A_f is a maximal V-order if and only if it is a valuation ring of Σ_f.*
2. *If $J(V)$ is a non-principal ideal of V, then A_f is an extremal V-order if and only if it is a valuation ring of Σ_f.*
3. *If $J(V)$ is a non-principal ideal of V and $\overline{V}$ is a perfect field, then A_f is an extremal V-order if and only if it is an Azumaya algebra over V.*

Proof. If S is finitely generated over V, then A_f is also finitely generated over V. By remarks following [8, Proposition 1.8], a finitely generated V-order in Σ_f is a valuation ring if and only if it is a maximal V-order.

If A_f is extremal then, since it is finitely generated over V, it must be a semihereditary order by [8, Proposition 1.8]. If $J(V)$ is not a principal ideal of V, then A_f is a maximal order by Theorem 2.6 hence it is a valuation ring. Further, $H = G$. If in addition $\overline{V}$ is a perfect field, then K/F is tamely ramified and defectless by [10, Theorem 2(b)]. By [3, 18.3 & 18.6], we conclude that K/F is unramified and defectless, since S is finitely generated over V and $J(V)$ is not a principal ideal of V. Therefore A_f is Azumaya over V by Theorem 2.5. □

This chapter has dealt with general results about the crossed-product order A_f. To obtain sharper results however, we need to impose conditions on the extension K/F, which we shall do in the following chapters.

3. The case when K/F is tamely ramified and defectless

The case which is most amenable to analysis occurs when K/F is tamely ramified and defectless. This is because the key to studying the properties of interest to us of the crossed-product order A_f lies in having a workable description of its Jacobson radical. This is accomplished in the following theorem.

Theorem 3.1. *If K/F is tamely ramified and defectless, then $J(A_f) = J_G(A_f)$.*

Proof. First, suppose that V is indecomposed in K. Then

$$J_G(A_f) = \sum_{\sigma \in H} J(S)x_\sigma + \sum_{\sigma \notin H} Sx_\sigma.$$

Hence $A_f/J_G(A_f) = \sum_{\sigma \in H} \overline{S}\overline{x}_\sigma$, a semisimple ring by [10, Theorem 2(a)], since K/L, where L is the fixed field of H, is also a tamely ramified and defectless extension. Hence $J_G(A_f) = J(A_f)$ if V is indecomposed in K.

In general, let $x = \sum_\gamma s_\gamma x_\gamma \in J(A_f) \setminus J_G(A_f)$. Then there exists a $\sigma \in G$, and a maximal ideal M of S, such that $s_\sigma, f(\sigma, \sigma^{-1}) \notin M$. We fix this M. Observe that $xx_{\sigma^{-1}} = \sum_\gamma s_\gamma f(\gamma, \sigma^{-1})x_{\gamma\sigma^{-1}} \in J(A_f)$ and has constant term $s_\sigma f(\sigma, \sigma^{-1}) \notin M$, and hence $xx_{\sigma^{-1}} \notin J_G(A_f)$.

Thus the set $\{\sum_\gamma s_\gamma x_\gamma \in J(A_f) \setminus J_G(A_f) \mid s_1 \notin M\}$ is non-empty. Let $y = \sum_{\sigma_i} s_{\sigma_i} x_{\sigma_i}$, with $\sigma_1 = 1$, be a member of this set with the least length. Let $s \in S$ and $j > 1$. Then $y' = \sigma_j(s)y - ys = \sum_{i \neq j} (\sigma_j(s) - \sigma_i(s)) s_{\sigma_i} x_{\sigma_i} \in J(A_f)$. If $(\sigma_j(s) - s)s_{\sigma_1} \notin M$, then $y' \in J(A_f) \setminus J_G(A_f)$ has a shorter length than y, which is not possible. Therefore $(\sigma_j(s) - s)s_{\sigma_1} \in M$ for every $s \in S$, and so $\sigma_j(s) - s \in M$ for every $s \in S$. Thus, either $s_{\sigma_j} = 0$, or $\sigma_j \in G^Z$, and so $y \in S(G^Z) \cap J(A_f)$.

Since $y \in J(A_f)$ and $S(G^Z) \subseteq A_f$, we have $1 - z_1 y z_2 \in U(A_f)$ for all $z_1, z_2 \in S(G^Z)$. Whence $(1 - z_1 y z_2)^{-1} \in A_f \cap K(G^Z) = S(G^Z)$ for all $z_1, z_2 \in S(G^Z)$. This shows that $y \in J(S(G^Z))$.

Observe that $MS(G^Z)$ is an ideal of $S(G^Z)$. Let

$$\psi : S(G^Z) \mapsto S(G^Z)/MS(G^Z)$$

be the natural homomorphism. Then $\psi(J(S(G^Z))) \subseteq J(S(G^Z)/MS(G^Z))$, since ψ is onto. But $S(G^Z)/MS(G^Z)$ is finite dimensional over $\overline{V}$. So there is a positive integer n such that $J(S(G^Z))^n \subseteq MS(G^Z)$.

Let $I = J(S(G^Z))S_M$, an ideal of $S(G^Z)S_M = A_{f_M}$. Then $I^n \subseteq J(S_M)A_{f_M} \subseteq J(A_{f_M})$, hence $I \subseteq J(A_{f_M})$. This shows that $y \in J(A_{f_M}) = \sum_{\gamma \in H_M} J(S_M)x_\gamma + \sum_{\gamma \in G^Z \setminus H_M} S_M x_\gamma$. This contradicts the fact that the constant term of y is a unit in S_M. Therefore $J(A_f) = J_G(A_f)$. □

Initially, the author could prove the statement above only in the case when V is indecomposed in K. The minimal length argument employed above was first used by Wilson in [25, Theorem 4.3] to show that, when V is a DVR and K/F is tamely ramified, then $J(A_f) = \sum_{\sigma \in G} I_\sigma x_\sigma$. Instead of "going down"

to the residue ring $S(G^Z)/MS(G^Z)$, Wilson "went up" to the completion of A_f in order to obtain a contradiction.

If K/F is not tamely ramified and defectless, then we may have $J(A_f) \neq J_G(A_f)$, even when $H = G$ (see [10, Examples 1 and 2]).

The graph $\mathrm{Gr}(f)$ is *lower subtractive*: given $\sigma H \leq \tau H$, we have $\sigma H \leq \gamma H \leq \tau H$ if and only if $\sigma^{-1}\gamma H \leq \sigma^{-1}\tau H$ (see [4]). This follows from the cocycle identity $f^\sigma(\sigma^{-1}\gamma, \gamma^{-1}\tau)f(\sigma, \sigma^{-1}\tau) = f(\sigma, \sigma^{-1}\gamma)f(\gamma, \gamma^{-1}\tau)$.

The following theorem generalizes [25, Theorem 2.15], which in turn generalizes [4, Theorem 2.3]. In either case, V was a DVR of F.

Theorem 3.2. *Suppose K/F is tamely ramified and defectless. Assume $J(V)$ is a principal ideal of V, and V is indecomposed in K. Then the following are equivalent:*

1. *The crossed-product order A_f is semihereditary.*
2. *$f(\sigma, \tau) \notin J(S)^2$ for every $\sigma, \tau \in G$.*
3. *H is a normal subgroup of G and G/H is cyclic. Further, either $H = G$, or there exists a $\sigma \in G$ such that $G/H = \langle \sigma H \rangle$, the graph $Gr(f)$ is $H \leq \sigma H \leq \sigma^2 H \leq \cdots \leq \sigma^{|G/H|-1}H$, and $J(A_f) = x_\sigma A_f$.*

Proof. Let v be a valuation on K corresponding to S and let $J(S) = \pi_S S$.

(1) $\Rightarrow$ (2). Suppose A_f is semihereditary. We will first show that $f(\sigma, \sigma^{-1}) \notin J(S)^2$ for all $\sigma \in G$. Fix $\sigma \in G$. By Lemma 2.7, it does no harm to assume that σH is a maximal vertex of $\mathrm{Gr}(f)$. Suppose $f(\sigma, \sigma^{-1}) \in J(S)^2$. Let $x = (1/\pi_S)x_\sigma$. We will now show that $x \in O_l(J(A_f))$. Recall that $J(A_f) = \sum_{\gamma \in H} J(S)x_\gamma + \sum_{\gamma \notin H} Sx_\gamma$. If $\tau \in H$, then $x\pi_S x_\tau = (\sigma(\pi_S)/\pi_S)f(\sigma, \tau)x_{\sigma\tau} \in J(A_f)$, since $\sigma(\pi_S)/\pi_S \in S$ and $\sigma\tau \notin H$. If $\tau \notin H$, then we distinguish two cases.

Case 1: $\sigma\tau \in H$. Then $f(\sigma^{-1}, \sigma\tau) \in U(S)$ hence, from the identity

$$f^{\sigma^{-1}}(\sigma, \tau)f(\sigma^{-1}, \sigma\tau) = f(\sigma^{-1}, \sigma),$$

we see that $f(\sigma, \tau) \in J(S)^2$, hence $xx_\tau = (f(\sigma, \tau)/\pi_S)x_{\sigma\tau} \in J(A_f)$, since $f(\sigma, \tau)/\pi_S \in J(S)$.

Case 2: $\sigma\tau \notin H$. Then $f(\sigma, \tau) = f(\sigma, \sigma^{-1}(\sigma\tau)) \notin U(S)$, otherwise we would have $\sigma H \leq \sigma\tau H$ hence, by the maximality of σH, we would end up with $\sigma H = \sigma\tau H$. This would contradict the fact that $\tau \notin H$. Thus $xx_\tau \in J(A_f)$.

This shows that $x \in O_l(J(A_f))$, contradicting the fact that, since A_f is semihereditary, $O_l(J(A_f)) = A_f$ [8, Theorem 1.5]. So $f(\sigma, \sigma^{-1}) \notin J(S)^2$ for all $\sigma \in G$. Since $f^\sigma(\sigma^{-1}, \sigma\tau)f(\sigma, \tau) = f(\sigma, \sigma^{-1})$, $f(\sigma, \tau) \notin J(S)^2$ for every $\sigma, \tau \in G$.

(2) $\Rightarrow$ (3). Now suppose $f(\sigma, \tau) \notin J(S)^2$ for every $\sigma, \tau \in G$. First, we will show that G/H is totally ordered. Let $\sigma, \tau \in G$ and write $\sigma = \tau\gamma$. We may assume $\sigma H \neq \tau H$, so that $\gamma \notin H$. Then $f(\gamma, \gamma^{-1}) \notin U(S)$ hence, since $f(\gamma, \gamma^{-1}) \notin J(S)^2$, we must have $v(f(\gamma, \gamma^{-1})) = v(\pi_S)$. Since $f(\tau, \gamma)f(\tau\gamma, \gamma^{-1}) = f^\tau(\gamma, \gamma^{-1})$ and $v(\pi_S)$ is the smallest positive element of Γ_S, one of $f(\tau, \gamma) = f(\tau, \tau^{-1}(\tau\gamma))$, $f(\tau\gamma, \gamma^{-1}) = f(\tau\gamma, (\tau\gamma)^{-1}\tau)$ must be in $U(S)$.

Therefore either $\tau H \leq \tau\gamma H = \sigma H$, or $\sigma H = \tau\gamma H \leq \tau H$, so that G/H is totally ordered.

We will now show that H is a normal subgroup of G. If $\sigma H \leq \tau H$ and $h \in H$, then $h^{-1}H = H \leq \sigma H \leq \tau H$. By lower subtractivity of the graph of f, we construe that $h\sigma H \leq h\tau H$. Thus left multiplication by elements of H preserves the ordering on G/H. Since G/H is a finite totally ordered set, we must have $h\sigma H = \sigma H$ for every $\sigma \in G$, $h \in H$. This shows that H is a normal subgroup of G.

Suppose $H \neq G$. Since G/H is totally ordered, the set $\{\gamma H \mid \gamma \notin H\}$ has a unique minimal element, say σH. We will show that $H \leq \sigma H \leq \sigma^2 H \leq \cdots \leq \sigma^i H \leq \cdots \leq \sigma^{r-1} H$, where r is the smallest positive integer for which $\sigma^r \in H$. The proof is by induction on i. We know that $H \leq \sigma H$. Suppose $H \leq \sigma H \leq \sigma^2 H \leq \cdots \leq \sigma^{i-1} H$ for some $i < r$. Since $\sigma^{-1}\sigma^{i-1}H = \sigma^{i-2}H \leq \sigma^{i-1}H = \sigma^{-1}\sigma^i H$ by assumption and $\sigma H \leq \sigma^i H$, we conclude by lower subtractivity that $\sigma H \leq \sigma^{i-1} H \leq \sigma^i H$, hence the claim. We fix σ.

Let $\gamma \in G$. We will now show that $\gamma H \in \{\sigma^i H \mid 0 \leq i < r\}$. Since G/H is totally ordered, we can choose $i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, r-1\}$ to be the greatest such that $\sigma^i H \leq \gamma H$. If $\sigma^i H \neq \gamma H$, then $\sigma^{-i}\gamma H \neq H$. Hence $\sigma H \leq \sigma^{-i}\gamma H$. Since $\sigma^i H \leq \gamma H$ and $\sigma^{-i}\sigma^{i+1}H = \sigma H \leq \sigma^{-i}\gamma H$, we have $\sigma^i H \leq \sigma^{i+1} H \leq \gamma H$ by the lower subtractivity of the graph of f, contradicting the maximality of i. So $\gamma H = \sigma^i H$, $G/H =< \sigma H >$, and the graph of f is

$$H \leq \sigma H \leq \sigma^2 H \leq \cdots \leq \sigma^{|G/H|-1} H.$$

Since $\sigma \notin H$, we have $x_\sigma \in J(A_f)$, as $J(A_f) = \sum_{\gamma \in H} J(S)x_\gamma + \sum_{\gamma \notin H} S x_\gamma$. Therefore $x_\sigma A_f \subseteq J(A_f)$. We will now show equality. Let $a \in S$. If $\gamma \in H$, then $v(f(\sigma, \sigma^{-1}\gamma)) = v(\pi_S)$, hence $b = (a\pi_S / f(\sigma, \sigma^{-1}\gamma))^{\sigma^{-1}} \in S$ and $a\pi_S x_\gamma = x_\sigma \cdot b x_{\sigma^{-1}\gamma} \in x_\sigma A_f$. If $\gamma \notin H$, then $\sigma H \leq \gamma H$, hence $f(\sigma, \sigma^{-1}\gamma) \in U(S)$ and $c = (a/f(\sigma, \sigma^{-1}\gamma))^{\sigma^{-1}} \in S$. We have $a x_\gamma = x_\sigma \cdot c x_{\sigma^{-1}\gamma} \in x_\sigma A_f$. Therefore $J(A_f) = x_\sigma A_f$.

(3) $\Rightarrow$ (1). If $H = G$, then the result follows from [10, Theorem 2(a)], otherwise $J(A_f) = x_\sigma A_f$ is a projective ideal of A_f and the result follows from Lemma 2.1. □

The gist of the proof of the theorem above is based on the work of Wilson on crossed-product orders over DVRs. His arguments in [25, Theorem 2.15] hold here almost verbatim and we have deliberately preserved them to illustrate the fact that, when $J(V)$ is a principal ideal of V then the theory of these crossed-products resembles the classical theory when V is a DVR. Naturally, there had to be some departures form his approach to cater to this general situation.

An *invariant valuation ring* is a Dubrovin valuation ring of a division algebra D which is stable under all inner automorphisms of $U(D)$.

Proposition 3.3. *Suppose the extension K/F is not necessarily tamely ramified and defectless. Assume $|H| = 1$ and V is indecomposed in K. Then the crossed-product order A_f is semihereditary if and only if the following two conditions hold:*

1. Σ_f *is a cyclic division algebra.*
2. A_f *is an invariant valuation ring of* Σ_f.

If in addition $J(V)$ *is a principal ideal of* V *and* $K \neq F$, *then the following statements are equivalent:*

1. *The crossed-product order* A_f *is semihereditary.*
2. $f(\gamma, \tau) \notin J(S)^2$ *for every* $\gamma, \tau \in G$.
3. *There is a generator* σ *of the group* G *such that* $J(A_f) = x_\sigma A_f$, *and the graph* $Gr(f)$ *is the chain*

$$1 = H \leq \sigma H \leq \sigma^2 H \leq \cdots \leq \sigma^{|G|-1} H.$$

Proof. Suppose $J(V)$ is non-principal ideal of V. If A_f is semihereditary, then $G = H = 1$ by Theorem 2.6 and we are done. From now on, suppose $J(V)$ is a principal ideal of V. The given hypothesis implies that $A_f/J_G(A_f) = \overline{S}$, a field, hence $J(A_f) = J_G(A_f)$ and A_f is primary. If A_f is semihereditary, then it would be a valuation ring of Σ_f, hence $f(\gamma, \tau) \notin J(S)^2$ for every $\gamma, \tau \in G$ by Corollary 2.9. Further, since A_f is an integral Dubrovin valuation ring in this case and the matrix size of $\overline{A}_f$ is one, from [22, Theorem F, Theorem G, & Corollary G] we conclude that Σ_f must be a division algebra, and A_f is an invariant valuation ring of Σ_f. The rest of the arguments are as in Theorem 3.2 above. □

If W is a valuation ring of F such that $V \subsetneqq W$, let $R = WS$. A routine argument shows that R is the integral closure of W in K (see, for example, [13, Lemma 2.3]). Let $W_1, W_2, \ldots, W_m$ be all the extensions of W to K. Let V_{ij} be all the extensions of V to K such that $WV_{ij} = W_i$, $i = 1, 2, \ldots, m$. Such V_{ij} exist for each i: let $\widetilde{V}'$ be a valuation ring of $\overline{W}_i$ lying over $\widetilde{V} = V/J(W)$. Then $V' = \{t \in W_i \mid t + J(W_i) \in \widetilde{V}'\}$ is a valuation ring of K lying over V such that $WV' = W_i$. Clearly, the V_{ij} are all the extensions of V to K, and we have

$$J(S) = \bigcap_i \bigcap_j J(V_{ij}) \supseteq \bigcap_i J(W_i) = J(R).$$

We record for later use the fact that $J(R) \subseteq J(S) \subseteq I_\sigma$ for each $\sigma \in G$.

Now let M be a maximal ideal of S, and let $N = J(WS_M) \cap R$, a maximal ideal of R. Since $J(R_N) \subseteq J(S_M)$, $G^T(R_N \mid F) = \{\sigma \in G \mid \sigma(x) - x \in J(R_N), \forall x \in R_N\}$ is a subgroup of $\{\sigma \in G \mid \sigma(x) - x \in J(S_M), \forall x \in S_M\} = G^T(S_M \mid F)$. Therefore, if V is tamely ramified and defectless in K then so is W by [10, Lemma 1]: if $0 < q := \mathrm{Char}(\overline{W})$, then $q = \mathrm{Char}(\overline{V})$, hence $\gcd(q, |G^T(R_N|F)|) = 1$ since $G^T(R_N|F)$ is a subgroup of $G^T(S_M|F)$.

Denote by B_f the W-order $WA_f = \sum_{\sigma \in G} Rx_\sigma$ and, for each $\sigma \in G$, let $J_\sigma = \bigcap N$, where the intersection is over all the maximal ideals N of R for which $f(\sigma, \sigma^{-1}) \notin N$. Then $J(B_f) = \sum_{\sigma \in G} J_\sigma x_\sigma$ by Theorem 3.1.

Of particular interest is the following situation: suppose $J(V)$ is a principal ideal of V and $\mathrm{rank}(V) > 1$. Let $P = \bigcap_{n \geq 1} J(V)^n$. Then P is a prime ideal of V, $W = V_P$ is a minimal overring of V in F, and $\widetilde{V} = V/J(W)$ is a DVR of $\overline{W}$. We shall henceforth refer to W in this case as the minimal overring of V in F.

Theorem 3.4. *Suppose K/F is tamely ramified and defectless and $J(V)$ is a principal ideal of V. Then the following are equivalent:*

1. *A_f is semihereditary.*
2. *A_f is an extremal V-order.*
3. *$O_l(J(A_f)) = A_f$.*
4. *If M is a maximal ideal of S, then $f(\sigma, \sigma^{-1}) \notin M^2$ for all $\sigma \in G$.*
5. *If M is a maximal ideal of S, then $f(\sigma, \tau) \notin M^2$ for all $\sigma, \tau \in G$.*
6. *$J(A_f)$ is a projective ideal of A_f.*

When this happens then, for each maximal ideal M of S, the graph $Gr(f^M)$ is a chain.

Proof. If A_f is semihereditary V-order then it is an extremal V-order [8, Theorem 1.5], and if A_f is an extremal V-order then $O_l(J(A_f)) = A_f$ [8, Proposition 1.4]. But $J(A_f) = J_G(A_f)$, by Theorem 3.1. Therefore conditions (3), (4), and (5) are all equivalent, by Theorem 2.8. Now we will show that if (3) and (5) are true, then (6) is also true. The conclusion holds when V is indecomposed in K, by Theorem 3.2, so let us assume that V decomposes in K.

Given that $O_l(J(A_f)) = A_f$, if the Krull dimension of V is one, then V is a DVR and A_f is hereditary and so $J(A_f)$ is a projective ideal of A_f and we are done. So assume the dimension is greater than one. Let W be the minimal overring of V in F. Set $B_f = WA_f$ and $R = WS$, as above. The condition that $f(\sigma, \tau) \notin M^2$ for all $\sigma, \tau \in G$ and every maximal ideal M of S implies that $f(\sigma, \tau) \in U(WS_M)$ for all $\sigma, \tau \in G$ and every maximal ideal M, which in turn implies that $f(\sigma, \tau) \in U(R)$ for all $\sigma, \tau \in G$. Thus $J_\sigma = J(R)$ for every $\sigma \in G$, hence $J(B_f) = \sum_{\sigma \in G} J_\sigma x_\sigma = \sum_{\sigma \in G} J(R) x_\sigma \subseteq \sum_{\sigma \in G} I_\sigma x_\sigma = J(A_f)$.

We first show that the integral closure of $\widetilde{V} = V/J(W)$ in $Z(\overline{B}_f)$ is contained in $A_f/J(B_f)$. So let $y \in B_f$ be an element satisfying the condition that $\overline{y} = y + J(B_f) \in Z(\overline{B}_f)$ and $\overline{y}$ is integral over $\widetilde{V}$. Write $y = \sum_{\sigma \in G} b_\sigma x_\sigma$ with $b_\sigma \in R$. We will show that $y \in A_f$ by showing that $b_\sigma \in S_M$ for each maximal ideal M of S.

Fix a maximal ideal M of S. Let $N = J(WS_M) \cap R$, a maximal ideal of R. Since $\overline{B}_f = \sum_{\sigma \in G} \overline{R} \tilde{x}_\sigma$, we may write $\overline{y} = \sum_{\sigma \in G} \overline{b}_\sigma \tilde{x}_\sigma$ with $\overline{b}_\sigma = b_\sigma + J(R) \in \overline{R}$. We have $\overline{R} = R_1 \oplus R_2 \oplus \cdots \oplus R_n$, where $R_i = R/N_i$, and $N = N_1, N_2, \ldots, N_n$ are the maximal ideals of R. Let e_i be the multiplicative identity of R_i. Let $\tau \in G \setminus G^Z(R_N|F)$. We want to show that $b_\tau \in J(R)$.

Suppose there exists an i_0 such that $b_\tau \notin N_{i_0}$. Choose a $\gamma \in G$ satisfying $N^\gamma = N_{i_0}$, so that we have $\gamma^{-1}(b_\tau) \notin N$. Then, since $\overline{b}_\tau \tilde{x}_\tau \in Z(\overline{B}_f)$, we have $(e_1 \tilde{x}_{\gamma^{-1}})(\overline{b}_\tau \tilde{x}_\tau) = (\overline{b}_\tau \tilde{x}_\tau)(e_1 \tilde{x}_{\gamma^{-1}})$, and therefore

$$e_1 \gamma^{-1}(\overline{b}_\tau) \overline{f(\gamma^{-1}, \tau)} = \tau(e_1) \overline{b}_\tau \overline{f(\tau, \gamma^{-1})}.$$

This is a contradiction, since $e_1 \gamma^{-1}(\overline{b}_\tau) \overline{f(\gamma^{-1}, \tau)} \neq \overline{0}$ but $\tau(e_1) = e_j$ for some $j \neq 1$. Therefore $y = \sum_{\sigma \in G^Z(R_N|F)} b_\sigma x_\sigma + t$, where $t \in J(B_f)$. Let $y' = \sum_{\sigma \in G^Z(R_N|F)} b_\sigma x_\sigma$ and let $B_{f_M} = WA_{f_M}$. Since $G^Z(R_N|F) \subseteq G^Z(S_M|F)$, we

see that $y' \in B_{f_M}$; clearly, $y' + J(B_{f_M})$ is an element of $Z(\overline{B}_{f_M})$ integral over $\widetilde{V}$.

By Theorem 3.2, A_{f_M} is semihereditary, since $f_M(\tau,\gamma) \notin M^2$ for every $\tau,\gamma \in G^Z(S_M|F)$, hence A_{f_M} is extremal in Σ_{f_M}. The argument in [9, Theorem 2] shows that $y' \in A_{f_M}$. Since $J(R) \subseteq S$, the preceding discussion shows that $b_\sigma \in S_M$ for each $\sigma \in G$. Because the choice of the maximal ideal M of S was arbitrary, we conclude that $y \in A_f$ as claimed.

Therefore we have the following: $WA_f = B_f$, $J(B_f) \subseteq J(A_f)$, $O_l(J(A_f)) = A_f$, and the integral closure of $\widetilde{V}$ in $Z(\overline{B}_f)$ is contained in $A_f/J(B_f)$. The argument in [9, Theorem 2] now shows that $A_f/J(B_f)$ is a hereditary ring, hence $J(A_f)/J(B_f)$ is a projective ideal of $A_f/J(B_f)$. But $B_f = WA_f = (WJ(V))A_f = (J(V)A_f)W \subseteq J(A_f)W \subseteq J(A_f)B_f \subseteq B_f$, hence $J(A_f)B_f = B_f$. The argument in [17, Lemma 4.11] shows that $J(A_f)$ is a projective ideal of A_f.

(6) $\Rightarrow$ (1): This follows from Lemma 2.1.

The last assertion follows from Proposition 2.10. □

When V is a DVR, Theorem 3.4 takes on a particularly elegant form:

Corollary 3.5. *If V is a DVR and K/F is tamely ramified, then the crossed-product order A_f is hereditary if and only if all the values of the two-cocycle f are square-free in S.*

Remark 3.6. Suppose V is a DVR tamely ramified in K. Then [25, Theorem 4.14] says that, if for every maximal ideal M of S there exists a "nice" set of right coset representatives of $G^Z(S_M|F)$ in G as described in Section 1, then the crossed-product order A_f is hereditary if and only if $f(\sigma,\tau) \notin M^2$ for every maximal ideal M of S, and for every $\sigma,\tau \in G^Z(S_M|F)$. The presence of a "nice" set of right coset representatives is not necessary for A_f to be hereditary (see [12, Example]); indeed, Theorem 3.4 and Corollary 3.5 say that the precise condition for A_f to be hereditary is that, as M runs through the maximal ideals of S, $f(\sigma,\tau) \notin M^2$ not just for $\sigma,\tau \in G^Z(S_M|F)$, but rather *for all* $\sigma,\tau \in G$. This small apparent oversight seems to have occurred in [14, §4.3] as well. We will revisit this issue later in Corollary 3.17 below.

Conditions (1),(2),(3) and (6) of the theorem above again show that the behavior of the crossed-product order A_f when $J(V)$ is a principal ideal of V mirrors that of classical orders over DVRs. We shall pursue this theme throughout this paper. Here is one more piece of evidence for such an assertion, which follows from condition (2) above:

Corollary 3.7. *Suppose $J(V)$ is a principal ideal of V and K/F is tamely ramified and defectless. If the crossed-product order A_f is a maximal V-order, then it is semihereditary.*

The author suspects that the conclusion of the corollary above remains valid when $J(V)$ is a non-principal ideal of V. In general, even when $J(V)$ is a principal ideal of V, a maximal V-order in a central simple F-algebra need not be semihereditary if it is not a crossed-product order (see [17, Theorem 5.7]).

Corollary 3.8. *Suppose K/F is tamely ramified and defectless, A_f is semihereditary, and G_1 is a subgroup of G.*

1. *If L is the fixed field of G_1, and U is a valuation ring of L lying over V, then $A_{f_{L,U}}$ is semihereditary.*
2. *The ring $S(G_1)$ is semihereditary.*

Proof. If $J(V)$ is not a principal ideal of V, then the statements follow from Theorem 2.6 and Lemma 2.2; otherwise Part (1) follows from Theorem 3.4, and Part (2) follows from Part (1) and [18, Lemma 2.2]. □

Although the converse of Proposition 2.12 does not hold even when the extension K/F is tamely ramified and defectless, there is still a "local-global" character to the property of being semihereditary: A_f is semihereditary if and only if, for each $\sigma \in G$, $S(\langle\sigma\rangle)$ is semihereditary. In fact, to determine whether or not A_f is semihereditary, it is more efficient to focus only on the maximal vertices of the graph of f:

Corollary 3.9. *Let $\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \ldots, \sigma_m \in G$ be such that the $\sigma_i H$ are all the maximal vertices of the graph $Gr(f)$. If K/F is tamely ramified and defectless then the following statements are equivalent:*

1. *The crossed-product order A_f is semihereditary.*
2. *For each $\sigma \in G$, the $\langle\sigma\rangle$-graded ring $S(\langle\sigma\rangle)$ is semihereditary.*
3. *For each i, the $\langle\sigma_i\rangle$-graded ring $S(\langle\sigma_i\rangle)$ is semihereditary.*
4. *For each maximal ideal M of S, $f(\sigma_i, \sigma_i^{-1}) \notin M^2$ for all i.*

Proof. If A_f is semihereditary, then $S(\langle\sigma\rangle)$ is semihereditary for each $\sigma \in G$ by Corollary 3.8.

If $S(\langle\sigma_i\rangle)$ is semihereditary and M is a maximal ideal of S, let L_i be the fixed field of σ_i, and let $U_i = S_M \cap L_i$. By [17, Lemma 4.10], $A_{f_{L_i,U_i}}$ is semihereditary, hence $f(\sigma_i, \sigma_i^{-1}) \notin M^2$.

Now suppose that $\sigma_i H$ are all the maximal vertices of the graph of f and $f(\sigma_i, \sigma_i^{-1}) \notin M^2$ for every maximal ideal M of S and for each i. Fix a $\sigma \in G$, and a maximal ideal M of S. Choose σ_j, $1 \leq j \leq m$, such that $\sigma H \leq \sigma_j H$. From the cocycle identity $f^\sigma(\sigma^{-1}\sigma_j, \sigma_j^{-1}) f(\sigma, \sigma^{-1}) = f(\sigma, \sigma^{-1}\sigma_j) f(\sigma_j, \sigma_j^{-1})$, it follows that $f(\sigma, \sigma^{-1}) \notin M^2$, hence A_f is semihereditary. □

The corollary above holds even when $J(V)$ is not a principal ideal of V, by Lemma 2.2 and Theorem 2.6. We are now going to give yet another characterization of semihereditary crossed-product orders in Theorem 3.14 below, but first we need the following results.

Wilson showed in [25, Theorem 3.4] that, if V is a DVR indecomposed in K, then $G^T \subseteq H$ whenever A_f is hereditary. In general, if A_f is semihereditary, then so is A_{f_M} for each maximal ideal M of S. Hence, if V is a DVR or $J(V)$ is not a principal ideal of V, then $G^T(S_M \,|\, F) \subseteq H_M$ whenever A_f is semihereditary. But the following simple example shows that this is not true in general.

Example 3.10. We give an example of a semihereditary crossed-product order A_f with V indecomposed in K but $G^T \not\subseteq H$.

Let $F = \mathbb{Q}(x, y)$, $K = F(\sqrt{y})$, and V the standard rank-2 valuation ring of F with $J(V) = xV$. Then $G = \{1, \sigma\} = G^T$, where σ is defined by $\sigma(\sqrt{y}) = -\sqrt{y}$. Define a two-cocycle $f : G \times G \mapsto S^{\#}$ by $f(1,1) = f(1,\sigma) = f(\sigma,1) = 1$ and $f(\sigma,\sigma) = x$. Then A_f is semihereditary by Theorem 3.4. By Proposition 3.3, A_f is actually an invariant valuation ring of Σ_f since $|H| = 1$ and V is indecomposed in K. But $G^T \not\subseteq H$. □

If $J(V) = \pi V$ is a principal ideal of V, let V' be an extension of V to K with valuation v, and let $E = \{\delta \in \Gamma_{V'} \mid 0 \leq \delta < v(\pi)\}$. Then $\epsilon = \epsilon(V' \mid F) = |E|$ is called the *inertial index* of V' over F. If $J(V') = \pi_v V'$, then $v(\pi_v)$ is the smallest positive element of $\Gamma_{V'}$. A routine argument shows that $E = \{0, v(\pi_v), v(\pi_v^2), \ldots, v(\pi_v^{\epsilon-1})\}$ and $v(\pi_v^{\epsilon}) = v(\pi)$. Therefore, if W is the minimal overring of V in F and $W' = WV'$, then $\epsilon(V'|F) = e(V'/J(W')|\overline{W})$ $(= [\Gamma_{V'/J(W')} : \Gamma_{V/J(W)}])$.

Suppose $\epsilon(V' \mid F) = e(V' \mid F)$. For later use, we record the following two consequences of this assumption. Firstly, $\Gamma_{V'}/\Gamma_V$ must be a cyclic group of order $e(V' \mid F)$ with $v(\pi_v) + \Gamma_V$ as a generator. Secondly, if $a \in V$ satisfies $v(a) < e(V' \mid F)v(\pi_v)$, then $v(a) < \epsilon(V' \mid F)v(\pi_v) = v(\pi_v^{\epsilon}) = v(\pi)$. Hence $v(a) = 0$, that is, $a \in U(V)$. (We shall make use of the first observation in Proposition 4.6 of Section 4, and of the second observation in Remark 3.12 below.)

Suppose V_1 is a valuation ring of K lying over V. Then the extension K/F is called *totally ramified* if $[K : F] = [\Gamma_{V_1} : \Gamma_V]$. The extension K/F is called *tame totally ramified* if it is both totally ramified and tamely ramified. Of course when this happens, V is defectless in K.

Lemma 3.11. *Suppose that K/F is tame totally ramified and S is finitely generated over V. If A_f is semihereditary, then $H = G$.*

Proof. The lemma is true when $J(V)$ is not a principal ideal of V, by Theorem 2.6. From now on, assume that $J(V)$ is a principal ideal of V. If the Krull dimension of V is one, then V is a DVR and the lemma is a result of Wilson [25, Theorem 3.4]. For the sake of completeness, we now present a slight variant of his argument: suppose the conclusion does not hold. By Theorem 3.2, there exists a $\sigma \in G$ such that $f(\sigma, \sigma^{-1}) \notin U(S)$, $G/H = \langle \sigma H \rangle$, and the graph of f is

$$H \leq \sigma H \leq \sigma^2 H \leq \cdots \leq \sigma^{|G/H|-1} H.$$

If F' is the fixed field of σ, $G' = \mathrm{Gal}(K/F') = \langle \sigma \rangle$, $f' = f_{|_{G' \times G'}}$, and H' is the subgroup of G' associated to f', then $H' = H \cap \langle \sigma \rangle$. Since $G/H = \langle \sigma H \rangle$, we have $\langle \sigma \rangle / (\langle \sigma \rangle \cap H) \cong G/H$. Therefore the graph of f' is

$$H' \leq \sigma H' \leq \sigma^2 H' \leq \cdots \leq \sigma^{|G'/H'|-1} H'.$$

The extension K/F' is also tame totally ramified. Thus it does no harm to assume that $G = \langle \sigma \rangle$, and then show that we cannot have $f(\sigma, \sigma^{-1}) \notin U(S)$. Let $n = |G|$, and $r = |G/H|$. Since $H \neq G$, we have $r > 1$.

First assume that (F,V) is complete. By [23, Propositions 3.1], there exists $\pi_S \in S$, and an n^{th}-root of unity $\omega \in V$, such that $J(S) = \pi_S S$ and $\sigma(\pi_S) = \omega\pi_S$. The argument in [23, Proposition 2.1] shows that $\overline{\omega}$ is a *primitive* n^{th}-root of unity in $\overline{V}$.

We have $(x_\sigma)^r = f(\sigma,\sigma)f(\sigma^2,\sigma)\cdots f(\sigma^{r-1},\sigma)x_{\sigma^r}$. Since

$$H \leq \sigma H \leq \sigma^2 H \leq \cdots \leq \sigma^{r-1}H,$$

we have

$$f(\sigma,\sigma) = f(\sigma,\sigma^{-1}\sigma^2), f(\sigma^2,\sigma) = f(\sigma^2,\sigma^{-2}\sigma^3),\ldots,$$
$$f(\sigma^{r-2},\sigma) = f(\sigma^{r-2},\sigma^{2-r}\sigma^{r-1}) \in U(S).$$

On the other hand, if $f(\sigma^{r-1},\sigma) \in U(S)$ then we would have $x_\sigma \in U(A_f)$, a contradiction. Since A_f is hereditary, we have $f(\sigma^{r-1},\sigma) \notin J(S)^2$ and so $f(\sigma^{r-1},\sigma) = z\pi_S$ for some $z \in U(S)$. So $(x_\sigma)^r = t\pi_S x_{\sigma^r}$ for some $t \in U(S)$. Therefore $(x_\sigma)^n = ((x_\sigma)^r)^{n/r} = (t\pi_S x_{\sigma^r})^{n/r} = \omega^m \pi_S^k u$ for some $u \in U(S)$, $k = n/r$, and m some integer. Since $r > 1$, we have $1 \leq k < n$. Then

$$(x_\sigma)^{n+1} = (x_\sigma)^n x_\sigma = \omega^m \pi_S^k u x_\sigma$$

and

$$(x_\sigma)^{n+1} = x_\sigma (x_\sigma)^n = x_\sigma \omega^m \pi_S^k u = \omega^{m+k}\pi_S^k \sigma(u) x_\sigma.$$

Therefore $\omega^m\pi_S^k u = \omega^{m+k}\pi_S^k\sigma(u)$ whence $\omega^k = u/\sigma(u)$ and therefore $\overline{\omega}^k = \overline{1}$ in $\overline{V}$, contradicting the fact that $\overline{\omega}$ is a primitive n^{th}-root of unity in $\overline{V}$ and $1 \leq k < n$. We should therefore always have $H = G$ when (F,V) is complete.

If (F,V) is not complete, let $(\widehat{F},\widehat{V})$ be the completion of (F,V). Since V is indecomposed in K, $\widehat{K} = K\widehat{F}$ is a field, and $\widehat{S} = S \otimes_V \widehat{V}$ is a valuation ring of $\widehat{K}$ lying over $\widehat{V}$. Further, the extension $\widehat{K}/\widehat{F}$ has the same group G as K/F and satisfies the hypothesis of this lemma. Let $\widehat{f} : G \times G \mapsto \widehat{S}^{\#}$ be given by $\widehat{f}(\sigma,\tau) = f(\sigma,\tau)$ for all $\sigma,\tau \in G$. Then $A_{\widehat{f}} = \sum_{\sigma\in G} \widehat{S}x_\sigma (\cong A_f \otimes_V \widehat{V})$ is hereditary, hence $\widehat{f}(\sigma,\sigma^{-1}) \in U(\widehat{S}) \cap S = U(S)$ for all $\sigma \in G$. Therefore $H = G$ as claimed.

Now suppose that the Krull dimension of V is greater than one. Let W be the minimal overring of V in F, let $R = WS$ and $B_f = WA_f$ as before. Since A_f is semihereditary, $f(\sigma,\tau) \notin J(S)^2$ for all $\sigma,\tau \in G$, hence $f(\sigma,\tau) \in U(R)$ for all $\sigma,\tau \in G$, since $J(R) \subseteq J(S)^2$. Then

$$\epsilon(S|F) = e(S/J(R)|\overline{W}) \leq [\overline{R} : \overline{W}] \leq [K : F] = e(S|F).$$

Because S is finitely generated over V, we have $\epsilon(S|F) = e(S|F)$ by [3, Theorem 18.6], hence $[\overline{R} : \overline{W}] = [K : F]$ and so $e(R|F) = 1$. But W is tamely ramified and defectless in K. Therefore W is unramified and defectless in K, $\text{Gal}(\overline{R}/\overline{W}) = G$, and B_f is Azumaya over W by Theorem 2.5. Further, if $\overline{f}(\sigma,\tau) := f(\sigma,\tau) \bmod J(R)$ for all $\sigma,\tau \in G$, then $\overline{f} : G \times G \mapsto (S/J(R))^{\#}$ is a normalized two-cocycle, and $A_f/J(B_f) = A_{\overline{f}}$ is a crossed-product $V/J(W)$-algebra in $\Sigma_{\overline{f}} = \overline{B}_f = (\overline{R}/\overline{W}, G, \overline{f})$. Observe that $Z(A_{\overline{f}}) = V/J(W)$ is a DVR

tame totally ramified in $\overline{R}$ as $e(S/J(R)|\overline{W}) = [\overline{R} : \overline{W}]$ and $\mathrm{Char}(\overline{V}) \nmid |G|$. Further, $A_{\overline{f}}$ is hereditary by Theorem 3.2. We conclude that $G = H$ as claimed. □

Remark 3.12. Here is an alternate and quick way of proving Lemma 3.11: given the assumptions of the lemma, let $\sigma \in G$ be of order $n > 1$, let L be the fixed field of σ, and let $U = S \cap L$. The assumptions given imply that $\epsilon(S|L) = e(S|L) = n$ and, if $J(S) = \pi_S S$ and v is a valuation on K corresponding to S, then the following holds: if $u \in U$ satisfies $v(u) < nv(\pi_S)$ then $v(u) = 0$. Now let $a = \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} f(\sigma^i, \sigma)$. Then $a \in U$, by [20, Theorem 30.3]. Since A_f is semihereditary, $v(f(\sigma^i, \sigma)) \leq v(\pi_S)$, hence $v(a) = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} v(f(\sigma^i, \sigma)) \leq (n-1)v(\pi_S) < nv(\pi_S)$. Hence $a \in U(S)$, and thus $f(\sigma^{-1}, \sigma) = f(\sigma^{n-1}, \sigma) \in U(S)$. This shows that $H = G$.

However, this alternate approach above does not build on the techniques already in place when V is a DVR, and hence does not quite illuminate the close connection we want to maintain between our theory and the classical theory. We shall, nonetheless, use the trick above later in Proposition 3.16.

Proposition 3.13. *Assume K/F is tamely ramified and defectless, S is finitely generated over V, and A_f is a semihereditary order. Let M be a maximal ideal of S. Then:*

1. *$G^T(S_M|F) \subseteq H_M$. In particular, if V is indecomposed in K then $G^T \subseteq H$.*
2. *If K/F is an abelian extension, then $G^T(S_M|F) \subseteq H$.*

Proof. If $J(V)$ is a not a principal ideal of V, then $H = G$ by Theorem 2.6 and we are done. So let us assume that $J(V)$ is a principal ideal of V.

(1) We know that $A_{f(M)}$ is semihereditary by Corollary 3.8. By Lemma 3.11, $f(\sigma, \sigma^{-1}) \notin M$ for every $\sigma \in G^T$, hence $G^T \subseteq H_M$.

(2) If G is abelian then, as M varies over the set of maximal ideals of S, the corresponding inertial groups coincide. By part (1), if $\sigma \in G^T$ then $f(\sigma, \sigma^{-1}) \notin N$ for each maximal ideal N of S, and hence $f(\sigma, \sigma^{-1}) \in U(S)$. □

Theorem 3.14. *Suppose K/F is tamely ramified and defectless and S is finitely generated over V. Then the following statements are equivalent:*

1. *The crossed-product order A_f is semihereditary.*
2. *For each maximal ideal M of S, we have $G^T(S_M \,|\, F) \subseteq H_M$ and there exists a set of right coset representatives $\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \ldots, \sigma_m$ of $G^T(S_M|F)$ in G such that for all i, $f(\sigma_i, \sigma_i^{-1}) \notin M^2$.*
3. *For each maximal ideal M of S, $A_{f_{(M)}}$ is semihereditary and there exists a set of right coset representatives $\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \ldots, \sigma_m$ of $G^T(S_M|F)$ in G such that for all i, $f(\sigma_i, \sigma_i^{-1}) \notin M^2$.*

Proof. (1) $\Leftrightarrow$ (2): Suppose A_f is semihereditary. Let M be a maximal ideal of S, and let $\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \ldots, \sigma_m$ be any set of right coset representatives of G^T in G. Then $G^T \subseteq H_M$ by Proposition 3.13, and $f(\sigma_i, \sigma_i^{-1}) \notin M^2$ by Theorem 2.6 (respectively Theorem 3.4) if $J(V)^2 = J(V)$ (respectively if $J(V)^2 \neq J(V)$).

Conversely, let M be a maximal ideal of S. Suppose $G^T \subseteq H_M$ and $\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \ldots, \sigma_m$ is a set of right coset representatives of G^T in G such that $f(\sigma, \sigma^{-1}) \notin M^2$ for each i. Let $\sigma \in G$. We will show that $f(\sigma, \sigma^{-1}) \notin M^2$.

There exists an i, $0 \leq i \leq m$, and an $h \in G^T \subseteq H_M$, such that $\sigma = h\sigma_i$. From the cocycle identity

$$f^{h^{-1}}(h\sigma_i, \sigma_i^{-1}h^{-1}) f^{h^{-1}}(h, \sigma_i) f^{\sigma_i}(\sigma_i^{-1}, h^{-1}) = f(h^{-1}, h) f(\sigma_i, \sigma_i^{-1}),$$

we conclude that $f^{h^{-1}}(\sigma, \sigma^{-1}) \notin M^2$ and, since $M^h = M$, we have $f(\sigma, \sigma^{-1}) \notin M^2$. It follows from Theorem 2.6 and Theorem 3.4 that A_f is semihereditary.

(2) $\Leftrightarrow$ (3): This now follows from Proposition 3.13 and [10, Theorem 2]. □

We end this section by highlighting further differences and similarities between our crossed-product orders, and the ones already in the literature.

The cocycle f is said to be *nullcohomologous over S* (respectively *nullcohomologous over K*) if $f \sim_S 1$ (respectively $f \sim_K 1$), where 1 denotes the trivial cocycle that takes on the constant value 1. We hasten to point out that we can have $f \sim_K 1$ *without* having $f \sim_S 1$, which is precisely why the following proposition supplants [10, Theorem 1].

It is well known that, if V is a DVR, then K/F is tamely ramified if and only if there is an $s \in S$ such that $\sum_{\sigma \in G} \sigma(s) = 1$ [1, Theorem 3.2]. This criterion is fully generalizable by [10, Corollary 1]: if V is an arbitrary valuation ring of F, then the Galois extension K/F is tamely ramified and defectless if and only if $\sum_{\sigma \in G} \sigma(s) = 1$ for some $s \in S$. We now have the following result, which generalizes a classical result by Auslander and Rim [1, Corollary 3.6] and is obtained by modifying a little an argument by Rosen (see [20, Theorem 40.13]).

Proposition 3.15. *Suppose f is nullcohomologous over K, but not necessarily nullcohomologous over S. Then A_f is semihereditary if and only if K/F is tamely ramified and defectless, and for all $\sigma, \tau \in G$ and every maximal ideal M of S, $f(\sigma, \tau) \notin M^2$.*

Proof. Since $f \sim_K 1$, there exists $k_\sigma \in K^\#$ such that, if $y_\sigma = k_\sigma x_\sigma$, then $y_\sigma y_\tau = y_{\sigma\tau}$ for all $\sigma, \tau \in G$. Suppose A_f is semihereditary. Let $x = \sum_{\sigma \in G} y_\sigma$. Let $\phi : A_f \mapsto A_f x : \phi(t) = tx$. Since A_f is a semihereditary order in Σ_f, $A_f x$ is a projective left A_f-module, hence there exists an A_f-module homomorphism $\psi : A_f x \mapsto A_f$ such that $\phi\psi = 1$. Let $\psi(x) = \sum_{\sigma \in G} s_\sigma x_\sigma$ with $s_\sigma \in S$. Fix a $\tau \in G$. Since $y_\tau x = x$, we have $\psi(y_\tau x) = \psi(x) = \sum_{\sigma \in G} s_\sigma x_\sigma$. On the other hand, $\psi(y_\tau x) = \psi(k_\tau x_\tau x)$. Since ψ is S-linear and K is the quotient field of S, we have $\psi(k_\tau x_\tau x) = k_\tau \psi(x_\tau x)$ in Σ_f, hence

$$\psi(k_\tau x_\tau x) = k_\tau x_\tau \psi(x) = k_\tau x_\tau \sum_{\sigma \in G} s_\sigma x_\sigma.$$

Therefore $\sum_{\sigma \in G} s_\sigma x_\sigma = \sum_{\sigma \in G} k_\tau \tau(s_\sigma) f(\tau, \sigma) x_{\tau\sigma}$. Hence $s_{\tau\sigma} = k_\tau \tau(s_\sigma) f(\sigma, \tau)$ and we get

$$s_\tau = k_\tau \tau(s_1).$$

Therefore $x = \phi\psi(x) = \phi(\sum_{\sigma\in G} s_\sigma x_\sigma) = (\sum_{\sigma\in G} s_\sigma x_\sigma)x = (\sum_{\sigma\in G} k_\sigma\sigma(s_1)x_\sigma)x = \sum_{\sigma\in G}\sigma(s_1)(k_\sigma x_\sigma x) = \sum_{\sigma\in G}\sigma(s_1)(y_\sigma x) = (\sum_{\sigma\in G}\sigma(s_1))x$.

We conclude that $\sum_{\sigma\in G}\sigma(s_1) = 1$, and thus K/F is tamely ramified and defectless. The rest follows from Theorem 2.6 and Theorem 3.4.

□

Unfortunately, when K/F is wildly ramified (that is, K/F is not tamely ramified) and $f \not\sim_K 1$, then there seems to be no simple criterion in general for determining when the crossed-product order A_f is semihereditary, other than the one contained in Lemma 2.1, even when $H = G$. In [10, Example 2]), we see a hereditary crossed-product order A_f where V is a DVR, $H = G$, and K/F is wildly ramified. Thus the case when K/F is wildly ramified is well worth exploring.

Now suppose the extension K/F is not necessarily tamely ramified and defectless. Let M be a maximal ideal of S. We let $G^V(S_M \,|\, F) = \{\sigma \in G \mid 1 - \frac{\sigma(x)}{x} \in J(S_M)\forall x \in K^\#\}$, the *ramification group of S_M over F*. We shall denote it simply by G^V if the context is clear. If $\overline{p}$ is the characteristic exponent of $\overline{V}$, then G^V is the only Sylow $\overline{p}$-subgroup of G^T [3, Theorem 20.18]. Therefore by [10, Lemma 2], the Galois extension K/F is tamely ramified and defectless if and only if $G^V = \{1\}$.

The following result generalizes a result of Harada (see [6, Theorem 2]).

Proposition 3.16. *Suppose rank$(V) = 1$ or $J(V)$ is non-principal ideal of V. Assume $\overline{V}$ is a perfect field. Then A_f is semihereditary if and only if K/F is tamely ramified and defectless, and for all $\sigma, \tau \in G$ and every maximal ideal M of S, $f(\sigma, \tau) \notin M^2$.*

Proof. If $J(V)$ is a non-principal ideal of V then the result was already covered in Theorem 2.6. From now on, let us assume that V is a DVR. Suppose A_f is hereditary. Let M be a maximal ideal of S. We will show that $G^V = \{1\}$. Since $G^V \subseteq G^Z$ and A_{f_M} is also hereditary by Proposition 2.12, we can, without loss of generality, assume that V is indecomposed in K.

Suppose $H \cap G^V \neq \{1\}$. By Lemma 2.2(2), $S(H \cap G^V)$ is hereditary, which contradicts Harada's result [6, Theorem 2]. Thus $H \cap G^V = \{1\}$, and so if L is the fixed field of H then K/L is tamely ramified and defectless, hence $J(S(H)) = \sum_{\sigma\in H} J(S)x_\sigma$ by Theorem 3.1. Therefore, since $J_G(A_f) = \sum_{\sigma\in H} J(S)x_\sigma + \sum_{\sigma\in G\setminus H} Sx_\sigma$, we conclude that $A_f/J_G(A_f)$ is semisimple, hence $J_G(A_f) = J(A_f)$. But since A_f is hereditary, $O_l(J(A_f)) = A_f$ hence, by Theorem 2.8, $f(\sigma, \tau) \notin J(S)^2$ for every $\sigma, \tau \in G$.

If $|G^V| > 1$, let $\sigma \in G^V$ be an element of order $\overline{p}$, with fixed field E. Let $U = S \cap E$. Since $\overline{V}$ is a perfect field, we have $\overline{U} = \overline{S}$, by [3, Theorem 19.11], hence $e(S|E) = \overline{p}$.

Let $a = \prod_{i=1}^{\overline{p}-1} f(\sigma^i, \sigma) \in U$. As was the case in Remark 3.12, we see that $a \in U(S)$ hence $\sigma \in H$, a contradiction. This shows that $G^V = \{1\}$ hence K/F is tamely ramified.

□

If $\mathrm{rank}(V) > 1$ and $J(V)$ is a principal ideal of V, then the proposition above does not hold, even when $H = G$ (see [10, Examples 1 & 2]).

A characterization of what is referred to as a "hereditary global crossed product order" in [14] is now realized in the following corollary. For purposes of the corollary, S will have a slightly different meaning from the one in use in the rest of the paper. The corollary gives the converse of [14, Theorem 4.9], and is obtained through central localization of the order $\sum_{\sigma\in G} Sx_\sigma$ by virtue of [20, Theorem 3.24].

Corollary 3.17. *Let F be an algebraic number field, K/F a finite Galois extension with group G, S the Dedekind ring of K, and $f : G\times G \mapsto S^\#$ a normalized two-cocycle. Then $\sum_{\sigma\in G} Sx_\sigma$ is a hereditary order in the crossed-product algebra $\sum_{\sigma\in G} Kx_\sigma$ if and only if for every maximal ideal M of S, S_M is tamely ramified over F and for all $\sigma,\tau \in G$, $f(\sigma,\tau) \notin M^2$.*

4. Dubrovin crossed-product orders

We now turn our attention to determining when the crossed-product order A_f is a valuation ring of Σ_f. Recall that the crossed-product order A_f is a valuation ring of Σ_f if and only if it is semihereditary and primary. We will therefore begin by characterizing primary crossed-product orders. We will for the most part assume that K/F is tamely ramified and defectless in this section, as we did in most of the previous section, to take full advantage of the theory developed thus far.

Lemma 4.1. *Suppose K/F is tamely ramified and defectless.*

1. *The crossed-product order A_f is primary if and only if, for some maximal ideal M of S, A_{f_M} is primary and there exists a set of right coset representatives $\sigma_1,\sigma_2,\ldots,\sigma_r$ of $G^Z(S_M \mid F)$ in G such that for all i, $f(\sigma_i,\sigma_i^{-1}) \notin M$.*
2. *If M is a maximal ideal of S, then the ring A_{f_M} is primary if and only if $A_{f_{(M)}}$ is primary.*
3. *If in addition $H = G$, then the following are equivalent:*
   (a) *A_f is primary.*
   (b) *A_{f_M} is primary for some maximal ideal M of S.*
   (c) *$A_{f_{(M)}}$ is primary for some maximal ideal M of S.*

Proof. Suppose A_f is primary and let M be a maximal ideal of S. Then $J(A_f)$ is a maximal ideal of A_f. Let $\widehat{M} = \bigcap N$, where the intersection ranges over all maximal ideals N of S different from M. Then $A_f\widehat{M}A_f = A_f$, since $\widehat{M} \supsetneqq J(S)$ hence $A_f\widehat{M}A_f \nsubseteqq J(A_f)$. The argument in [13, Lemma 2.7] (which was an adaptation of an argument in [4, Theorem 3.2]) shows that there is a set of right coset representatives $\sigma_1,\sigma_2,\ldots,\sigma_r$ of G^Z in G such that $f(\sigma_i,\sigma_i^{-1}) \notin M$ for all i. In general, whenever one has such a set of coset representatives of G^Z in G, we can use the argument in [4, Theorem 3.12] to show that $\overline{A}_f \cong M_r(\overline{A}_{f_M})$.

Observe that $\overline{A}_{f_M} = \overline{S}_M(H_M) = \overline{S_M(H_M)}$, hence A_{f_M} is primary if and only if $S_M(H_M)$ is primary. By [11, Proposition 1], $S_M(H_M)$ is primary if and only if $S_M(G^T \cap H_M)$ is primary. The result now follows from the fact that $\overline{A}_{f_{(M)}} = \overline{S}_M(G^T \cap H_M) = \overline{S_M(G^T \cap H_M)}$. □

Part (3) of the lemma above originally appeared in [11, Lemma 1 & Proposition 1]. We have included it here for the sake of completeness.

Recall that, if R is a ring, G_1 is a group acting trivially on R, and $g : G_1 \times G_1 \mapsto U(R)$ is a two-cocycle, then the crossed-product of G_1 over R is called a *twisted group ring*, denoted by $R^t[G_1]$ (see [19]).

Lemma 4.1 above and its proof immediately yields the following.

Proposition 4.2. *Suppose K/F is tamely ramified and defectless.*

1. *Let M be a maximal ideal of S.*
   (a) *If A_f is a valuation ring of Σ_f, then A_{f_M} is a valuation ring of Σ_{f_M}.*
   (b) *If A_{f_M} is a valuation ring of Σ_{f_M}, then $A_{f_{(M)}}$ is a valuation ring of $\Sigma_{f_{(M)}}$.*
2. *If in addition we also assume that V is indecomposed in K and A_f is semihereditary, then the following are equivalent:*
   (a) *The crossed-product order A_f is a valuation ring of Σ_f.*
   (b) *The crossed-product order $S(H)$ is a valuation ring of $K(H)$.*
   (c) *The crossed-product order $S(H \cap G^T)$ is a valuation ring of $K(H \cap G^T)$.*
   (d) *The crossed-product order $A_{f_{(M)}}$ is a valuation ring of $\Sigma_{f_{(M)}}$.*
   (e) *The twisted group ring $\overline{S}^t[H \cap G^T]$ is simple.*
   (f) *The H-graded ring $\overline{S}(H)$ is simple.*

Corollary 4.3. *Assume F is a local field with $\overline{V}$ finite. If A_f is a maximal order, then the Schur index of Σ_f is*

$$e(S|F) \cdot (|G| \,/\, |H|)\,.$$

Proof. Suppose A_f is a maximal order in Σ_f. By Proposition 3.16, K/F is tamely ramified. Let n be the matrix size of Σ_f. If s is the Schur index of Σ_f, then $|G|^2 = n^2 s^2$.

By [22, Theorem F], n is also the matrix size of $\overline{A}_f$. But $\overline{A}_f = \overline{S(H)}$ and $S(H)$ is a maximal order in $K(H)$. Therefore the matrix size of $K(H)$ is n.

Let $e = e(S|F)$. By a result of Wilson, $G^T \subseteq H$ (see Proposition 3.13(1)). Therefore, if L is the fixed field of H, then $e = e(S|L)$. Thus, if $U = S \cap L$, then e is the smallest positive integer such that $J(S)^e = J(U)S$.

Let Δ be the invariant valuation ring of the division algebra part of $K(H)$ with $Z(\Delta) = U$. Since $J(S(H)) = \sum_{\sigma \in H} J(S)x_\sigma$ and $S(H) \cong M_n(\Delta)$, e is the smallest positive integer such that $J(\Delta)^e = J(U)\Delta$. By [20, Theorem 14.3], the Schur index of $K(H)$ is e as $\overline{V}$ is finite. Therefore $|\,H\,|^2 = n^2 e^2$, hence $s = e(S|F) \cdot (|G| \,/\, |H|)$. □

If $F = \mathbb{Q}_p$ is the p-adic field and $H = G$, then the corollary above follows from [7, Theorem 1]. The point of the corollary above is that, in general, the Schur index is scaled up by the factor $|G| \,/\, |H|$.

Given a maximal ideal M of S, let $U = S_M \cap K^Z$ and let (K', S') be a Henselization of (K, S_M). Let (F_h, V_h) be the unique Henselization of (F, V) contained in (K', S'). As before, we observe that (F_h, V_h) is also a Henselization of (K^Z, U).

Theorem 4.4. *Suppose K/F is tamely ramified and defectless. Then the crossed-product order A_f is a valuation ring of Σ_f if and only if, for some maximal ideal M of S, A_{f_M} is a valuation ring of Σ_{f_M} and there exists a set of right coset representatives $\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \ldots, \sigma_r$ of $G^Z(S_M|F)$ in G such that for all i, $f(\sigma_i, \sigma_i^{-1}) \notin M$.*

In particular if $H = G$ and K/F is tamely ramified and defectless, then the crossed-product order A_f is a valuation ring of Σ_f if and only if, for some maximal ideal M of S, A_{f_M} is a valuation ring of Σ_{f_M}; if and only if, for some maximal ideal M of S, $A_{f_{(M)}}$ is a valuation ring of $\Sigma_{f_{(M)}}$.

Proof. The result obviously holds when V is indecomposed in K, so assume that V decomposes in K. Suppose A_f is a valuation ring of Σ_f. Let M be a maximal ideal of S. By Proposition 2.12 and Lemma 4.1, A_{f_M} is a valuation ring of Σ_{f_M} and there is a set of right coset representatives $\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \ldots, \sigma_r$ of G^Z in G such that $f(\sigma_i, \sigma_i^{-1}) \notin M$ for all i.

On the other hand, suppose there exists a set of right coset representatives $\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \ldots, \sigma_r$ of G^Z in G such that $f(\sigma_i, \sigma_i^{-1}) \notin M$ for all i. Then $A_f \otimes_V V_h \cong M_r(A_{f_M} \otimes_U V_h)$, as was seen in [13, Lemma 2.7] (see also the remark following [4, Theorem 3.12]). Therefore, if in addition A_{f_M} is a valuation ring of Σ_{f_M}, then $A_{f_M} \otimes_U V_h$ is a valuation ring of $\Sigma_{f_M} \otimes_{K^Z} F_h$ by [22, Theorem F], hence $M_r(A_{f_M} \otimes_U V_h)$ is a valuation ring of $M_r(\Sigma_{f_M} \otimes_{K^Z} F_h) = \Sigma_f \otimes_F F_h$ by [2, §1, Theorem 7], and so A_f is a valuation ring of Σ_f. □

An easy application of Theorem 4.4 can be made to the crossed-product order A_{f_2} given in [4, Example 4.5]; if we set $f = f_2$ we see that given any maximal ideal M of S in that example, there is indeed a set of right coset representatives of G^Z in G with the desired property. Further, $H_M = \{1\}$ and $f_M(\sigma, \tau) \notin M^2$ for each $\sigma, \tau \in G^Z$. Hence, by Proposition 3.3, A_{f_M} is a valuation ring of Σ_{f_M} and so A_f is indeed a valuation ring of Σ_f as was already demonstrated in [4]. As an aside, we make the following quick observation: in the example in [4], f $(= f_2)$ was constructed from a two-cocycle $\overline{f}$ in $Z^2(G^Z, S_M^{\#})$ in such a manner that $\mathrm{Gr}(\overline{f}) = \mathrm{Gr}(f_M)$, using an intricate procedure called "lifting" which was developed in that paper. Here the reverse happened: we have been handed down an already constructed f from which f_M has been effortlessly extracted.

Said differently, Theorem 4.4 says that if K/F is tamely ramified and defectless, then the crossed-product order A_f is a valuation ring of Σ_f if and only if it is primary and there exists a maximal ideal M of S such that A_{f_M} is a valuation ring of Σ_{f_M}. When this happens, A_{f_N} is a valuation ring of Σ_{f_N} for

every maximal ideal N of S. When $H = G$, then the result above can also be found in [11, Proposition 1].

Remark 4.5. Therefore, if K/F is tamely ramified and defectless, the crossed-product order A_f is a valuation ring of Σ_f if and only if the following three conditions hold: it is semihereditary; for each maximal ideal M of S, $A_{f_{(M)}}$ is a valuation ring of $\Sigma_{f_{(M)}}$; and there exists a set of right coset representatives $\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \ldots, \sigma_r$ of G^Z in G such that for all i, $f(\sigma_i, \sigma_i^{-1}) \notin M$. The existence of a "nice" set of representatives is necessary here (cf. Remark 3.6): if we do not have a "nice" set of coset representatives, then A_{f_M} could be a valuation ring of Σ_{f_M} for every maximal ideal M of S without A_f being a valuation ring of Σ_f (see [12, Example]).

We have effective criteria for determining when A_f is semihereditary. Assuming that we can get hold of "nice" coset representatives of G^Z in G as above, the program of determining when the crossed-product order A_f is a valuation ring of Σ_f really boils down to determining when $A_{f_{(M)}}$ is a valuation ring of $\Sigma_{f(M)}$. It is therefore warranted to focus our attention on the case when K/F is tame totally ramified due to the preceding results. By the condition given in Proposition 4.2(2)(c), we may even restrict ourselves to the case when $H = G$. Here is a special case of this instance.

Proposition 4.6. *Suppose K/F is tame totally ramified, S is finitely generated over V, $H = G$, and (F, V) is Henselian. Then the following are equivalent:*

1. *The crossed-product order A_f is a valuation ring of Σ_f.*
2. *Σ_f is a division algebra.*

When this happens, A_f is an invariant valuation ring of Σ_f and Σ_f is a cyclic division algebra.

Proof. If $J(V)$ is not a principal ideal of V, then $e(S\,|\,F) = \epsilon(S\,|\,F) = 1$, by [3, Theorem 18.3 & Theorem 18.6], hence $K = F$ and we are done. So assume $J(V)$ is a principal ideal of V.

Note that $G = G^T(S|F)$. Since K/F is tamely ramified and defectless, if $\overline{p}$ is the characteristic exponent of $\overline{V}$ then $\gcd(|G^T|, \overline{p}) = 1$ by [10, Lemma 1(a)]. Therefore by [3, 20.18, 20.12, & 20.2], we have $G^T \cong \Gamma_S/\Gamma_V$, since Γ_S/Γ_V is $\overline{p}$-free. The remark before Lemma 3.11 shows that G is a cyclic group, since $e(S|F) = \epsilon(S|F)$ as S is finitely generated over V by [3, Theorem 18.6]. Let $G = \langle\sigma\rangle$, $n = |G|$, and let $a = \prod_{i=0}^{n-1} f(\sigma^i, \sigma) \in U(V)$.

Suppose A_f is a valuation ring of Σ_f. Note that

$$\overline{A}_f \cong \overline{V}^t[G] \cong \overline{V}[X]/(X^n - \overline{a}),$$

a commutative ring. Since A_f is primary, $\overline{A}_f$ must be a field. This implies that Σ_f is a division algebra and A_f is an invariant valuation ring of Σ_f, as we saw in the proof of Proposition 3.3.

Now suppose Σ_f is a division algebra. Since (F, V) is Henselian, Σ_f admits an invariant valuation ring extending V. Since $H = G$ and K/F is tamely ramified and defectless, A_f is semihereditary, hence it is the invariant valuation ring of Σ_f lying over V by [8, Theorem 1.9]. □

Note that, in the proposition above, Σ_f is a division algebra if and only if the ramification index of S over F is equal to the Schur index of Σ_f. In other words, the proposition above says that, with the rather strong assumptions given, A_f is a valuation ring of Σ_f if and only if the ramification index of S over F is equal to the Schur index of Σ_f (cf. [7, Theorem 1]).

5. The graphs of cocycles

Let M be a maximal ideal of S. For a $\sigma \in G^Z$, the assignment $\sigma H_M \mapsto [\sigma]_M$ is a well-defined graph monomorphism $\psi_M : \mathrm{Gr}(f_M) \mapsto \mathrm{Gr}(f^M)$ which embeds $\mathrm{Gr}(f_M)$ inside $\mathrm{Gr}(f^M)$. In particular, if $\mathrm{Gr}(f^M)$ is a chain then so is $\mathrm{Gr}(f_M)$. As in [4, Proposition 3.4(c)], the canonical map $\mathrm{Gr}(f) \mapsto \prod_{M\,\max} \mathrm{Gr}(f^M)$ is injective. Also note that, when V is indecomposed in K, then for each $\sigma \in G$ the equivalence class $[\sigma]_{J(S)}$ is a singleton, and the graphs $\mathrm{Gr}(f)$, $\mathrm{Gr}(f_{J(S)})$, and $\mathrm{Gr}(f^{J(S)})$ all coincide.

If there exists a set of right coset representatives $\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \ldots, \sigma_r$ of G^Z in G such that for all i, $f(\sigma_i, \sigma_i^{-1}) \notin M$ then the argument in [4, Proposition 3.4(b)], and the remarks following [4, Proposition 3.3] show that the map $\phi_M : \mathrm{Gr}(f) \mapsto \mathrm{Gr}(f_M)$ given by $\phi_M(\sigma H) = dH_M$ where $d \in G^Z$ satisfies $f(d^{-1}\sigma, \sigma^{-1}d) \notin M$ is a well-defined graph epimorphism. Let $c_M : \mathrm{Gr}(f) \mapsto \mathrm{Gr}(f^M) : \sigma H \mapsto [\sigma]_M$ be the canonical graph epimorphism from $\mathrm{Gr}(f)$ to $\mathrm{Gr}(f^M)$. The connections between the graphs $\mathrm{Gr}(f)$, $\mathrm{Gr}(f_M)$ and $\mathrm{Gr}(f^M)$ are summed up in the following theorem. The theorem also characterizes the "nice" set of coset representatives of G^Z in G, which has been mentioned earlier, in terms of the graph homomorphism ψ_M.

Theorem 5.1. *Let N be a maximal ideal of S.*

1. *The graph homomorphism ψ_N is an isomorphism if and only if there exists a set of right coset representatives $\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \ldots, \sigma_r$ of $G^Z(S_N|F)$ in G such that for all i, $f(\sigma_i, \sigma_i^{-1}) \notin N$. When this happens, then ϕ_N is a well-defined graph epimorphism and the following diagram commutes:*



2. *If ψ_N is a graph isomorphism and M is another maximal ideal of S then:*
   (a) *the graphs $Gr(f^M)$, $Gr(f^N)$, $Gr(f_M)$ and $Gr(f_N)$ are all isomorphic (cf. [4, Proposition 3.7(2c)]), and*
   (b) *ψ_M is also a graph isomorphism.*

In particular, if K/F is tamely ramified and defectless and the crossed-product order A_f is primary then ψ_N is a graph isomorphism; the diagram above is always commutative; and as M ranges over all maximal ideals of S, the various graphs $Gr(f^M)$ and $Gr(f_M)$ are all isomorphic to one another.

Proof. Part (1) follows from the discussion following [4, Proposition 3.3]. For suppose ψ_N was an isomorphism. Let $\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \ldots, \gamma_r$ be right coset representatives of $G^Z(S_N|F)$ in G. Then there are elements $d_i \in G^Z(S_N|F)$ such that $[d_i]_N = [\gamma_i]_N$ for each i. Then the elements $\sigma_i = d_i^{-1}\gamma_i$ are right coset representatives of $G^Z(S_N|F)$ in G such that for all i we have $f(\sigma_i, \sigma_i^{-1}) \notin N$, since $f^{d_i}(d_i^{-1}\gamma_i, \gamma_i^{-1}d_i) = f(d_i, d_i^{-1}\gamma_i)f(\gamma_i, \gamma_i^{-1}d_i)$. Conversely, suppose we have such a set of right coset representatives of $G^Z(S_N|F)$ in G. Let $\gamma \in G$. Then there is $d \in G^Z(S_N|F)$ such that $\gamma = d\sigma_i$ for some i. Clearly, $\psi_M(dH_N) = [\gamma]_N$ so that ψ_N is an isomorphism.

For part (2), let M be a maximal ideal of S. By part (1), there exists a set of right coset representatives $\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \ldots, \sigma_r$ of $G^Z(S_N|F)$ in G such that for all i, $f(\sigma_i, \sigma_i^{-1}) \notin N$. Since the σ_i^{-1} form a complete set of *left* coset representatives of $G^Z(S_N|F)$ in G, there is a $\sigma \in \{\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \ldots, \sigma_r\}$ such that $M^\sigma = N$. We claim that there is a graph isomorphism from $\mathrm{Gr}(f^M)$ to $\mathrm{Gr}(f^N)$ given by

$$[\gamma]_M \mapsto [\sigma\gamma]_N.$$

For let $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \in G$. Then $f(\sigma, \gamma_i) \notin N$, since $f^\sigma(\sigma^{-1}, \sigma\gamma_i)f(\sigma, \gamma_i) = f(\sigma, \sigma^{-1}) \notin N$. If $[\gamma_1]_M = [\gamma_2]_M$, then $f(\gamma_1, \gamma_1^{-1}\gamma_2), f(\gamma_2, \gamma_2^{-1}\gamma_1) \notin M$, hence

$$f^\sigma(\gamma_1, \gamma_1^{-1}\gamma_2), f^\sigma(\gamma_2, \gamma_2^{-1}\gamma_1) \notin M^\sigma = N.$$

But

$$f^\sigma(\gamma_1, \gamma_1^{-1}\gamma_2)f(\sigma, \gamma_2) = f(\sigma, \gamma_1)f(\sigma\gamma_1, (\sigma\gamma_1)^{-1}(\sigma\gamma_2)),$$

and

$$f^\sigma(\gamma_2, \gamma_2^{-1}\gamma_1)f(\sigma, \gamma_1) = f(\sigma, \gamma_2)f(\sigma\gamma_2, (\sigma\gamma_2)^{-1}(\sigma\gamma_1)).$$

Therefore $[\sigma\gamma_1]_N = [\sigma\gamma_2]_N$ and the map above is indeed well-defined. Observe that the preceding argument is fully reversible: if $[\sigma\gamma_1]_N = [\sigma\gamma_2]_N$, then one can use the same steps in reverse to establish that $[\gamma_1]_M = [\gamma_2]_M$. Therefore the map is one-to-one as well. It is clearly onto.

Now if $[\gamma_1]_M \leq_M [\gamma_2]_M$, then $f(\gamma_1, \gamma_1^{-1}\gamma_2) \notin M$ hence $f^\sigma(\gamma_1, \gamma_1^{-1}\gamma_2) \notin M^\sigma = N$. But $f(\sigma, \gamma_2) \notin N$ and

$$f^\sigma(\gamma_1, \gamma_1^{-1}\gamma_2)f(\sigma, \gamma_2) = f(\sigma, \gamma_1)f(\sigma\gamma_1, (\sigma\gamma_1)^{-1}(\sigma\gamma_2)).$$

Therefore $[\sigma\gamma_1]_N \leq_N [\sigma\gamma_2]_N$. Conversely, if $[\sigma\gamma_1]_N \leq_N [\sigma\gamma_2]_N$ then $[\gamma_1]_M \leq_M [\gamma_2]_M$, as can be seen by simply reversing the preceding steps as before. Thus the graphs $\mathrm{Gr}(f^M)$ and $\mathrm{Gr}(f^N)$ are indeed isomorphic, and by part (1) they are both isomorphic to $\mathrm{Gr}(f_N)$.

Now set $\tau_i = \sigma^{-1}\sigma_i$. Then $f(\tau_i, \tau_i^{-1}) \notin M$, since $f(\sigma_i, \sigma_i^{-1}) \notin N$. Further, $\tau_i\tau_j^{-1}(M) = M$ if and only if $\sigma_i\sigma_j^{-1}(N) = N$, so that $\{\tau_1, \tau_2, \ldots, \tau_r\}$ forms a complete set of right coset representatives of $G^Z(S_M|F)$ in G. Thus ψ_M is also an isomorphism of graphs. □

From [12, Example], we see that the graphs $\mathrm{Gr}(f_M)$ and $\mathrm{Gr}(f^M)$ may not be isomorphic for any maximal ideal M of S in general. Also, we see from the

same example that you could have the graphs $\mathrm{Gr}(f^M)$ and $\mathrm{Gr}(f^N)$ isomorphic for every choice of maximal ideals M and N of S without ψ_X being a graph isomorphism for any maximal ideal X of S.

Further examples of graphs that would illustrate the various phenomena described in the theorem above can be found in [4, §4]. All the crossed-product orders in [4, §4] are primary, and the extension K/F is tamely ramified and defectless.

For the rest of this section we shall make use of the following observation. Let M be a maximal ideal of S and assume there exists a set of right coset representatives $\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \ldots, \sigma_r$ of G^Z in G such that for all i, $f(\sigma_i, \sigma_i^{-1}) \notin M$. Then, as we saw in the previous section, the following holds: $\overline{A}_f \cong M_r(\overline{A}_{f_M})$ and, if (F_h, V_h) is the Henselization of (F, V), we have $A_f \otimes_V V_h \cong M_r(A_{f_M} \otimes_U V_h)$ where $U = S_M \cap K^Z$. Note that all this is independent of whether or not the extension K/F is tamely ramified or defectless.

Corollary 5.2. *Suppose there exists a maximal ideal M of S such that ψ_M is a graph isomorphism. Then the crossed-product order A_f is a valuation ring of Σ_f (respectively is primary) if and only if the crossed-product order A_{f_M} is a valuation ring of Σ_{f_M} (respectively is primary).*

Remark 5.3. In the corollary above as well as elsewhere in this section, when a stated condition holds with respect to one maximal ideal of S, then the same condition holds for every maximal ideal of S. This is due to Theorem 5.1.

Corollary 5.4. *Suppose there exists a maximal ideal M of S such that ψ_M is a graph isomorphism. Then the following hold:*

1. *There is a one-to-one correspondence between the ideals of A_f containing $J(A_f)$ and the ideals of A_{f_M} containing $J(A_{f_M})$. This correspondence between the ideals preserves inclusion, products, and intersections. In particular, the number of maximal ideals of A_f and A_{f_M} is the same (cf. [4, Theorem 3.10]).*
2. *The crossed-product order A_f is semihereditary if and only if the crossed-product order A_{f_M} is semihereditary.*

Proof. Part (1) follows from the fact that $\overline{A}_f \cong M_r(\overline{A}_{f_M})$. Since $A_f \otimes_V V_h \cong M_r(A_{f_M} \otimes_U F_h)$, part (2) follows from [8, Theorem 3.4]. □

Part (2) of the corollary above generalizes [25, Theorem 4.14]. Also note that if $H = G$, then ψ_M is always a graph isomorphism, hence the conclusions of the corollary above always hold. But in general, if ψ_M is not a graph isomorphism, then the conclusions of the corollary above my not hold (see [12, Example]).

Acknowledgment

The author wishes to thank the referee for his/her detailed and helpful comments which have resulted in an improved exposition.

References

[1] M. Auslander, D. S. Rim, Ramification index and multiplicity, Illinois J. Math. 7(1963) 566–581.

[2] N. I. Dubrovin, Noncommutative valuation rings, Trudy Moskov. Mat. Obschch. 45(1982) 265-289; English translation, Trans. Moskow Math. Soc. 45(1984) 273-287.

[3] O. Endler, Valuation Theory, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1972.

[4] D. E. Haile, Crossed-Product Orders over Discrete Valuation Rings, J. Algebra 105(1987) 116–148.

[5] D. E. Haile, P. J. Morandi, A. R. Wadsworth, Bézout orders and Henselization, J. Algebra 173(1995) 394–423.

[6] M. Harada, Some criteria for hereditarity of crossed products, Osaka J. Math. 1(1964) 69–80.

[7] G. J. Janusz, Crossed product orders and the Schur index, Comm. Algebra 8(7)(1980) 697–706.

[8] J. S. Kauta, Integral Semihereditary Orders, Extremality, and Henselization, J. Algebra 189(1997) 226–252.

[9] J. S. Kauta, On Semihereditary Maximal Orders, Bull. London Math. Soc. 30(1998) 251–257.

[10] J. S. Kauta, Crossed product orders over valuation rings, Bull. London Math. Soc. 33(2001) 520–526.

[11] J. S. Kauta, H. Marubayashi, H. Miyamoto, Crossed product orders over valuation rings II: tamely ramified crossed product algebras, Bull. London Math. Soc. 35(2003) 541–552.

[12] J. S. Kauta, On a class of hereditary crossed-product orders, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., 141(5)(2013) 1545 – 1549.

[13] J. S. Kauta, On a class of semihereditary crossed-product orders, Pacific J. Math. 259(2)(2012) 349–360.

[14] V. Kessler, Crossed product orders and non-commutative arithmetic, J. Number Theory 46(1994) 255–302.

[15] H. Marubayashi, H. Miyamoto, A. Ueda, Y. Zhao, Semi-hereditary orders in a simple Artinian ring, Comm. Algebra 22(1994) 5209–5230.

[16] J. C. McConnell, J. C. Robson, Noncommutative Noetherian Rings, in 'Graduate Studies in Math.,' Vol. 30, American Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1987.

[17] P. J. Morandi, Maximal Orders over Valuation Rings, J. Algebra 152(1992) 313–341.

[18] P. J. Morandi, Noncommutative Prüfer rings satisfying a polynomial identity, J. Algebra 161(1993), 324–341.

[19] D. S. Passman, Infinite Crossed Products, Academic Press, San Diego, 1989.

[20] I. Reiner, Maximal Orders, Academic Press, London, 1975.

[21] J. J. Rotman, An Introduction to Homological Algebra, 2d ed., in 'Universitext', Springer, New York, 2009.

[22] A. R. Wadsworth, Dubrovin valuation rings and Henselization, Math. Ann. 283(1989) 301–328.

[23] S. Williamson, Crossed products and hereditary orders, Nagoya Math. J. 23(1963) 103–120.

[24] C. J. Wilson, Hereditary crossed product orders over discrete valuation rings, Ph.D. Thesis, Indiana University, 2011.

[25] C. J. Wilson, Hereditary crossed product orders over discrete valuation rings, J. Algebra 371(2012) 329-349.

[26] Z. Yi, Homological Dimension of skew group rings and crossed products, J. Algebra 164(1994) 101–123.